

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE KGB: THE REAL ENEMY—
PART THREE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the RECORD the final part of a New York Times series on the KGB. This part deals with KGB manipulation and exploitation of various "peace" groups in Europe. The Times states that while Western counterintelligence experts do not say these movements are creations of the KGB, they do say that the peace movement itself is "seen as an unusual target of opportunity for a full range of Soviet influence, extending beyond the KGB."

At this point, I wish to insert in the RECORD part three of "Tracking the KGB." This part is titled, "KGB Officers Try To Infiltrate Antiwar Groups" by John Vinocur, the New York Times, Tuesday, July 26, 1983.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, July 26, 1983]

K.G.B. OFFICERS TRY TO INFILTRATE
ANTIWAR GROUPS

(By John Vinocur)

COPENHAGEN.—Over the last two years, the Danish and Swiss governments have exposed attempts by ostensible Soviet diplomats, actually K.G.B. officers, to influence or buy their way into groups trying to block deployment of new medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

The cases are the best evidence offered by Western counterintelligence officers who believe that the Soviet espionage agency's highest priorities in Western Europe include attempts to exploit the disarmament movement.

The counterintelligence experts are quick to acknowledge that there are hundreds of thousands of people who oppose nuclear weapons and are not dupes of the K.G.B., of the local Communist Party or of the Soviet Union in any way.

Nowhere is the antinuclear movement regarded as a creation of Soviet policy. Rather, it is seen as an unusual target of opportunity for a full range of Soviet influence, extending beyond the K.G.B.

But in trying to demonstrate the Soviet efforts convincingly, Western officials run into problems. One is a reluctance to prosecute citizens involved in the antinuclear movement—where the K.G.B. has been conspicuously present—because of risks of domestic political backlash.

In 1981, when the Danish Government ousted a Soviet diplomat, identified as a major in the K.G.B., for trying to buy a place in the debate on nuclear weapons here, a Dane was arrested in the case but not prosecuted.

Danish disarmament groups described the whole affair as an attempt to defame them.

Something similar happened in Switzerland this spring. The Government closed the Bern bureau of Novosti, the Soviet press-feature agency, threw out its local chief and forced withdrawal of a Soviet diplomat it said was the K.G.B. officer responsible for overseeing Novosti's local operations.

The Swiss explanation for the action was that the Novosti staff had grossly interfered in Swiss affairs, notably the antinuclear movement.

However, two Swiss citizens were not charged although they were named in Federal Attorney's documents as having assisted Novosti.

EXCESSIVE REACTION CHARGED

The complaints in Switzerland, which is neutral, were the same as those in Denmark, which is a member of the Atlantic alliance. Critics said that the Government had overreacted, that its case was thin and that thousands of decent and loyal citizens had been tainted only because they were active in disarmament activity.

Beyond domestic political sensitivities, another problem acknowledged by counterintelligence officials is the fuzziness of Soviet involvement in what the K.G.B. calls "active measures"—operations to create a political effect abroad, as opposed to collection of information on weapons, politics and technology.

Last year in Congressional testimony, the United States Central Intelligence Agency acknowledged its difficulties and echoed those of other Western intelligence services.

"Political influence operations are the most important but least understood of Soviet active measures," it said. "They are difficult to trace and to deal with because they fall into the gray areas between a legitimate exchange of ideas and an active measures operation."

Last March, the Federal Bureau of Investigation said in a report to a Congressional committee:

"We do not believe the Soviets have achieved a dominant role in the U.S. peace and nuclear freeze movements or that they directly control or manipulate the movement."

The F.B.I. added: "It is extremely difficult to determine the extent to which various peace organizations and coalitions are being influenced or manipulated by the Soviet Union."

KEY ROLE FOR LOCAL COMMUNISTS

In Western Europe, a number of counterintelligence officials say that the attempts to exert influence are handled for the most part by the local Communist Party.

Soviet influence on the movements does exist, they say, but it is often—in a juridical sense—entirely legal. There is no reason for K.G.B. agents to tread where local Communist Party agents can carry out instructions of the International Department of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee—the body in Moscow that also coordinates the K.G.B.'s tasks and priorities.

An internal briefing paper prepared in June by the West German Interior Ministry

sought to evaluate Soviet intelligence involvement with the disarmament groups.

"In the Federal Republic," it said, "the Soviet Union has at its disposal for the advancement of its goals the German Communist Party (D.K.P.) and the linked organizations ready to serve it. The D.K.P. acts either in its own name, or in those of its related or influenced organizations, to bring the interests and directives of the Soviet Union into the planning and content of the actions of the peace movement in the Federal Republic."

The Bonn briefing paper went on:

"They have this opportunity because they have been allowed into the coordination and planning organizations of the 'peace movement' and have been able to create an audience and consideration. All experience shows that they are able to expressly hinder the acceptance or dissemination of positions that do not fit the political conception of the Soviet Union. As a result of the availability of the D.K.P. for the advancement of Soviet goals in relation to the 'peace movement,' there is no necessity for the direct intervention of the intelligence apparatus."

SENSITIVE TOPICS MANIPULATED

There are examples of the West German Interior Ministry's contention that the West German Communists are able to block discussion of matters uncomfortable to Soviet Union.

In April last year, members of the Green Party attending the final organizational meeting for a large demonstration against President Reagan and NATO during a summit meeting in Bonn, accused the West German Communist Party and its friends of dominating the proceedings.

United States policy around the world was condemned by the Germans and motions against Soviet interference in Poland and Afghanistan were rejected.

The positions—those to be officially supported at the demonstration—were so unbalanced that some members of the Green Party said they were considering staying away from the rally.

They did attend but with their own banners and orders of the day.

The security agency of the Netherlands, in a confidential paper prepared for a meeting of NATO security officials late in 1981, linked the International Department of the Soviet Communist Party and the Communist Party of the Netherlands in a coordinated effort to influence the nuclear attitudes of Dutch church groups.

'INSTRUCTIONS FROM MOSCOW'

Directly dealing with the K.G.B., it said, "It is known that K.G.B. officers in the Netherlands have received instructions from Moscow to promote protests against the neutron bomb, but it is difficult to ascertain how they have put these instructions into practice."

The Dutch security agency, however, documented a K.G.B. forgery, sent to activists, newspapers and politicians that purported to be a U.S. military paper revealing that the United States Pershing 2 and cruise missiles were part of a strategy aimed at

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

making a limited nuclear war in Europe possible.

According to an American intelligence specialist, the decisive point for the Soviet effort to block deployment will come in the fall, when West European countries expect violent confrontations with demonstrators.

"The question then," he said, "will be how hard the K.G.B. pushes. We know it has catalogues of shouters, marchers, street fighters, bomb throwers and killers it could turn loose. They can pick one from Column A, another from Column B. They could arrange a provocation, have a demonstrator shot with a stolen U.S. Army .45, or any number of things. Those are K.G.B. jobs and serious business. The only question for them is evaluating the margin of risk of a potential backfire and the possibility of satisfactory yield."

'AGENTS OF INFLUENCE' IN THE WEST

Stanislav Levchenko, a K.G.B. officer who defected to the United States in 1979, goes along with the view that the Soviet Union does exert influence in the West through Western Communist parties. But he also offers the view that it would be totally out of character for the K.G.B. to fail to concentrate on running "agents of influence"—often people willing to defend Soviet positions without formal recruitment—who can guide public positions of groups opposed to nuclear weapons.

"I think that 99.9 percent of the people active in the peace organizations are honest," Mr. Levchenko said in an interview, adding in regard to aspirations of the Soviet officials: "But they want a leader or two. They want somebody who stays late to write out the platform when they go home to bed. Those people stay busy. Sometimes it's just a slogan. But the degree of Soviet success so far has been great. The buildup of criticism on nuclear weapons by these groups has gone basically in only one direction—against NATO."

Mr. Levchenko's emphasis on a single slogan relates to what a Soviet defector has told Western intelligence officers about the K.G.B.'s efforts to turn the phrase "Neutron Carter" into a refrain in Western editorials. This was during the Soviet campaign in the late 1970's as the United States discussed developing and deploying neutron weapons as a shield against Soviet tanks.

In the same manner, there is some speculation, based on circumstantial evidence, that the phrase "No New Missiles in Europe" has been pushed in the same kind of campaign. The slogan tacitly accepts the presence of Soviet SS-20 medium-range missiles while condemning United States Pershing 2 and cruise missiles counterweapons, still to be deployed.

Experts said the slogan was first seen in 1981 on placards distributed by Communist front organizations in West Germany. It has reappeared since then, most recently in May on a banner in the German language—presumably for West German television audiences—at a demonstration in Williamsburg, Va., during a summit meeting of industrial nations.

The slogan appeared in Paris in June when Charles Fiterman, a Communist who is Minister of State for Transportation, spoke at a pacifist rally of 100,000 people.

Mr. Levchenko used the figure \$200 million in describing Soviet outlays in the campaign against the neutron weapon. That campaign was regarded by the K.G.B. as a remarkable success. The weapon was not deployed.

Questions are frequently posed in West European parliaments about the financing of the present antinuclear movements. But the clearest figure advanced, like the one offered by Mr. Levchenko, is short on documentation.

The C.I.A. has described the World Peace Council, a Soviet front, as receiving over half the \$63 million it estimates Moscow provided in 1980 to "its 13 major international fronts."

EVIDENCE OF SOVIET INVOLVEMENT

There are detailed examples of the Soviet intelligence agency's direct involvement in trying to manipulate the antinuclear movement.

In 1981, Denmark expelled Vladimir Merkulov, a second secretary of the Soviet Embassy who was identified as a K.G.B. major and head of Line PR, or the field section conducting active measures in Copenhagen operation. The action centered on a Dane, Arne Herlov Petersen, described as an "agent of influence" for Moscow.

According to Danish counterintelligence sources, Mr. Petersen, a journalist and writer, was recruited by Mr. Merkulov's predecessors and turned into an informant. He reported on the Danish left-wing movement and what the Justice Ministry described as "so-called progressive journalists."

Mr. Petersen was told not to join the Communist Party. Over the years he kept a diary detailing clandestine meetings with Soviet contacts. He had at least 23 encounters with Mr. Merkulov, the sources said, and was photographed on several such occasions.

Among Mr. Petersen's undertakings, according to the Justice Ministry, were publication of a pamphlet—based on a Soviet text and printed by the Joe Hill Press at the embassy's expense—attacking Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Britain as a threat to peace.

Mr. Merkulov also offered to pay for publication in Danish newspapers of advertisements in which influential Danish writers and artists expressed backing for a Nordic nuclear-free zone, a proposal supported by Moscow.

DANE SERVED AS A GO-BETWEEN

Mr. Petersen served as go-between in collecting the signatures—the artists and writers were not told of Soviet participation—and kept Mr. Merkulov informed on the campaign. Mr. Petersen was also said to have served as a conduit for documents believed to have been forged by the K.G.B.

In return, Mr. Petersen was said to have received money, liquor, trips to the Soviet Union and also what the Justice Ministry reported as a promise that he would be evacuated to the Soviet Union "in the case of imminent war."

Mr. Merkulov, according to the counterespionage sources, maintained contact with members of the Cooperation Committee, an umbrella organization grouping more than 50 Danish antinuclear and disarmament associations.

The sources said there was a "certain coordination" between Mr. Petersen, Mr. Merkulov, and an unnamed member of the committee, which had its offices for nine years in a building housing a Denmark-Soviet friendship association. The committee is now in premises owned by the Danish Communist Party's student organization.

The Danish authorities did not prosecute Mr. Petersen, but the then Minister of Justice, Ole Espersen, said in a television state-

ment last year that he was challenging Mr. Petersen to sue the Government for slander if he felt he was wrongfully accused. He even proposed to pay Mr. Petersen's legal fees so the case could be aired in public. The offer has not been accepted.

The case in Switzerland had the uncommon aspect that the Government ordered closure of the Bern bureau of Novosti, accusing it of functioning as a purveyor of disinformation and organizer of demonstrations, petitions and other activities.

The bureau chief, Aleksei Dumov, was expelled, Leonid Ovchinnikov, an embassy first secretary and press attaché, identified as a K.G.B. officer with responsibility for Novosti, left under Swiss pressure.

In a 25-page confidential document prepared for the Cabinet before the expulsions, the office of the Federal Attorney, which oversees counterespionage activities, listed a series of influence operations involving Novosti journalists, including the bureau's two Swiss employees.

There was an anti-American demonstration condemning policy in the Caribbean, a demonstration over El Salvador in which one of the Swiss staffers served as "responsible leader" and a demonstration inside the chambers of the Swiss Parliament in which the Novosti office, the report said, "went so far as to allow its employees to lead and watch over the operation."

Groups from the West German Communist Party, attending a peace demonstration in Bern in December 1981, "reported in to the Novosti bureau."

COORDINATOR OF PROTEST ACTIVITY

Last year, the report continued, the bureau advised people about transportation and costs for a peace demonstration in Bonn while President Reagan attended the Atlantic alliance meeting. After the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in June 1982 the Novosti office "operated as coordination point and starting area" for protest activities.

A declaration called the Swiss Peace Appeal, focusing on the United States and NATO as the causes of world tensions and initiated at meetings between Swiss groups and the World Peace Council in Moscow and Berlin, also had links to Novosti, the report stated.

"In the conclusive phase," it said, "Novosti-Bern journalists accomplished a large part of the development of the text of the appeal and coordination of the gathering of signatures."

The report concluded that the Swiss journalists working for Novosti had provided the agency with unusual access to Swiss life. "The Soviet secret services," it said, "could manage to remain in the background and slowly pull the strings."

SWISS JOURNALISTS NOT TRIED

As was the case with Mr. Petersen in Denmark, neither of the Swiss journalists was brought to trial. The Federal Attorney's confidential report, leaked to the Swiss press, was criticized as containing presumptions and blanket statements, but little proof.

Leftists saw the operation as an attempt by the Minister of Justice and Police Affairs, Rudolf Friedrich, to put the antinuclear movement in disrepute.

Mr. Friedrich said in Parliament that evidence in the case was enormous but that disclosure would not be in the interest of Switzerland's security.

He let it be understood that discretion about security "means and methods" was an overriding concern.

Mr. Friedrich, who ordered the expulsion of three Russians for espionage in January, was accused of seeing "Red under the bed." The debate lasted through June.

The Minister of Justice and Police had the final word. On the last day of June, he sent another Soviet "diplomat" home, this time a vice consul in Geneva who was accused of spying over several years.●

RAYMOND ROEBUCK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California for arranging this special order so that those of us who have known Raymond Roebuck for two decades can pay special tribute to him.

If Ray simply provided warm nourishment at outrageous hours—through Vietnam, through Watergate, through the long grueling sessions of this past week—it would be reason enough to thank him.

If Ray were just one of the best storytellers and trivia experts in this town, it would be reason enough to thank him.

If Ray Roebuck were no more than caring and paternal toward the junior Members of this body, it would be reason enough to thank him.

If Ray were simply a decent employee of this House, if he were simply a faithful worshipper, if he were only an exemplary citizen and a man who loves his job, it would be reason for each of us to quietly thank him on our own.

But, Mr. Speaker, Raymond Roebuck is all these things—and more.

He is a rock of stability, and for 20 years, a joyous, inspiring presence for us all—and that is why Ray Roebuck deserves more than our private thanks. That is why he deserves our special order on this day.●

EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received a letter from a teacher enclosing a statement about education in the United States from her perspective.

Her name is Mary Ellen Dillard, and she lives in Carbondale, Ill.

Her statement is one that everyone will not agree with in every respect, but is something all of us ought to reflect upon as we talk about really striving to achieve quality and excellence in education.

I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to read her statement.

The statement follows:

Education in the United States has evolved from a system whose goals were simply the teaching of reading and religion to a multi-faceted system that includes teaching the talented, providing for the special needs of the physically and mentally handicapped, training today's youth for adult citizenship in the future, and preparing young people to live successfully in a rapidly changing world. American education has accepted its role of developing its youth intellectually, socially, and emotionally. Through many crises, schools have endured the onslaught of criticism and have turned out a product that has helped to create one of the greatest nations in the world. We can take a great deal of pride in those accomplishments, but we have much improving we must do if we are to resolve the social, environmental, and technological problems facing our country and the world.

If Americans truly place a high priority on education, schools would be aesthetically eye-pleasing, comfort-controlled, and equipped with modern technological equipment as televisions, tape players, video taping equipment, stereo sets, up-to-date audiovisual films, slides, film strips, and rooms should be modern with carpeting, adequate lighting, flexible furniture that can be arranged in many ways, and textbooks should be up to date, in good condition, and relevant to the student's ability and experiences.

If American education is to be able to build on the American ideals of the equality of man, its citizens must accept busing as the only recognized way to insure a quality education to each child regardless of his race, economic standing, or social position.

If our schools are to become the most effective force in a child's life, they will combine the expertise of experts in a given field, university personnel, and elementary and secondary teachers to provide the most interesting and worthwhile educational programs available. They will cooperate in using the most comprehensive teaching strategies in the field, and they will develop meaningful in-service training to acquaint teachers with the most innovative and up-to-date research in the field of education.

If American schools are to become what they should be, we must recruit the finest teachers our universities can produce; we must convince them that teaching is a noble profession; and we must be selective in the hiring process. We must be willing to remove the incompetents by using fair and objective evaluation administered by competent administrators trained in teacher supervision. We must be willing to pay for excellence in education by paying salaries comparable to engineers and scientists if we hope to attract and keep outstanding teachers. We must rededicate ourselves to the profession of our choice, and we must work toward the goals and objectives we set.

If education in the United States is to become what it should be, we must relate to the children being educated the relationship between their learning and the real world of their community, their country, and the world. We must move our classrooms out into the community by opening up new vistas to students and showing how the facts they are learning are applied to solve real problems in the community. We must involve people from the outside to be mentors to help give young people new insights into unknown fields of work. We must make

young people a vital part of the place they live by involving them in service projects which develop pride and a sense of belonging in them. We must pay more attention to future needs because these young people are being trained and educated to live and adapt to a highly technological society. We must instill in them the problem-solving skills needed and the desire to use those skills to help to resolve the complex problems of today's society.

Lastly, if American education is to become the ultimate, then we all must work to that end, supporting the worthwhile, eliminating the known nonproductive, negative aspects, and actively opposing those whose special interest wish to destroy its aims. It is truly an awesome task, and to succeed it will require the best that is within us in human understanding, tolerance, intellectual talents, and sincere dedication to the democratic ideals on which America was founded.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN MERCER LANGSTON

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to the outstanding achievements of John Mercer Langston. John Mercer Langston was an outstanding American who managed to overcome racial discrimination during a difficult period in our Nation's history. In tribute to this great citizen, the newly renovated Middle School in Oberlin, Ohio, bears his name. It is my honor to reprint here the dedication speech of Oberlin School Board member, Mr. W. Dan Wolfe, given on July 3, 1983.

JOHN MERCER LANGSTON

(By W. Dean Wolfe)

Distinguished guests; alumni of the Oberlin Schools; citizens of the Oberlin School District; students, teachers, and staff; fellow members of the board of education—What a day! What a school building! What a community! What a man, John Mercer Langston!

History has recorded it, though society has largely ignored it, that John Mercer Langston was truly one of the most remarkable persons ever to make his home in Oberlin; he was in fact a man great in his time! It is both an honor and a privilege for me to have the task of sharing with you at this time some of the very impressive and challenging things that I have learned about John Langston. Before I do that, however, I must express my deep appreciation to Oberlin College archivist William Bigglestone and research associate Marlene Merrill for their able assistance and for their encouragement as I have researched and attempted to advance the Langston story. Many, many thanks to you both!

Sitting on this fine new stage today is a great mix of persons, many of whom are well known to each other and to many of you, but some of whom find themselves in the midst of total strangers. Nonetheless, there is a common bond which we all share. By virtue of positions now held or held in

the past, or by association with an institution or an organization, or by some action performed, we all connect in one way or another with the substance of John Langston's life. And I trust that those connections will become obvious to you over the next several minutes as I sketch a few glimpses of that life lived so long ago.

So, who was John Langston? And why do we give his name to this school? The youngest of four children born to a white plantation owner father and an emancipated black mother on a plantation in Virginia on December 14, 1829, John Langston demonstrated early on something of the character and intellect which were to power him to extraordinary achievements. Both of his parents, advanced in years, died when he was only four years old. Thus orphaned, he became the ward of his father's long-time friend Col. William Gooch of Chillicothe, Ohio. Young Langston's first schooling was provided by Gooch's daughters, who tutored him off and on for the better part of three years. At about age eight, he was enrolled in the Chillicothe public schools, where he was known as Johnny Gooch and apparently accepted as white. When the Gooch family decided to move to Missouri two years later, John stayed behind in order to be near his older brothers who had found homes in Chillicothe. So it was that he came to live his next six years in a series of foster homes, some black, some white, in Chillicothe and Cincinnati.

No longer accepted in the public schools because of his mixed race, his schooling was continued in private black schools in Chillicothe and Cincinnati. It was in such a school that he was taught by and came under the influence of George B. Vashon and William Cuthbert Whitehorn, both students at Oberlin College. (The long college recess in those days was during the winter months, and it was common for students to earn money for college expenses by teaching school during the vacation. Vashon later became the first black graduate of Oberlin College and Whitehorn was the second.) With substantial encouragement from Vashon and Whitehorn and supported by funds from his father's estate, Langston came north to Oberlin in 1844 and enrolled in the preparatory department of Oberlin College. Having done well at the end of the term, he was recruited to teach in a one-room black school in Hicks Settlement near Chillicothe in the winter of 1845. His salary for the three-month term was \$30; he was barely sixteen years old. Encouraged to continue his education at Oberlin by Vashon and Whitehorn and by his brothers Charles and Gideon, Langston matriculated into the regular curriculum in 1846 and proceeded to excel in his studies. He was awarded the B.A. degree in 1849.

Wanting to be a lawyer, he applied to all the better law schools, but none would accept him because of his color. In an interview with Langston, one law dean did offer to admit him if he would claim that he was Cuban! Insensured by this, Langston refused and returned to Oberlin and commenced theological studies in the seminary. In doing so, he achieved the first of many firsts that were to be his in the years ahead—he thus became the first black American admitted to the formal study of theology. Still longing for a career in law, he discussed his plight with the well-known abolitionist Philamon Bliss, then a district judge in nearby Elyria, and Bliss offered to tutor him in law. So, for the better of the next three years he studied law and theology concurrently. He

was awarded the M.A. degree in 1852 and was graduated from the Seminary in 1853. On September 13, 1854 Langston was admitted to the Ohio Bar thus becoming the first black lawyer not only in Ohio but in America!

Because his health had failed during the rigors of this dual professional studies, a doctor friend advised him to seek the health-producing benefits, of rural living and farming. So it was that Langston took his new wife, the former Carolina Wall, an Oberlin College student whom he had courted for several years, to a farm that he obtained in rural Brownhelm Township some eight miles north and west of Oberlin. And there it was that his health did return, and there it was that their first child was born, and there it was that his public life began in earnest.

While well accepted in Brownhelm, John Langston's law practice took him to many other Ohio communities and his reception was not always a cordial one. It was not uncommon in those days for him to be taunted with comments such as "here comes the nigger lawyer" and other racial epithets. Before long, however, his fierce pride in his blackness and in his citizenship, and his personal sense of worth combined with his effectiveness in the practice of law to make his formidable presence—and many of his detractors were won over or at least quieted.

He had been active in the Anti-Slavery Society since 1849, was a leader of it in Ohio, and was prominent at several national conventions of the society in the years leading up to the Civil War. He became active in politics and ran for township clerk in Brownhelm, winning election in 1855. This was a remarkable feat. He could not vote, nor could any woman. Nonetheless, he was elected, and by an all white and male electorate at that! Moreover, in doing so he became the first black American elected to public office!

Because of his continuing interest in education and his growing interest in politics, and because of his thriving law practice, Langston decided that he should return to Oberlin and make his home here. In the Spring of 1856 he bought a fine new house on East College Street in what was then considered the posh neighborhood of Oberlin and proceeded to establish his home. He set up his law office on North Main Street near the site now occupied by Hall Auditorium. Barely settled in, he entered into the life of Oberlin with a fervor! In 1857 he was elected to the Russia Township Board of Trustees, subsequently serving as clerk, legal counsel, and school visitor. Russia Township at that time operated its own school system, and as school visitor Langston was in practice superintendent of schools. He served on the Oberlin City Council in 1857 and 1858. When it was chartered by the State of Ohio in 1860, he became a charter member of the Oberlin Board of Education, a position he held for eleven years, six of them as its clerk. During these years he was a member of First Church, as he had been during his student days here. Of these pre-Civil War years in Oberlin, Langston wrote these words in his autobiography:

"The treatment accorded colored people in Oberlin socially was most remarkable; in keeping, however, with the professions religiously, politically, and educationally made by the founders of the community. Every Sunday colored people could be seen seated in conspicuous places in the only church in town, worshipping after the manner of

those in whose midst they lived, and no one molested or disturbed them. Such persons were made welcome as equals in the best families, as they were in every part of the College, and thus were given the best social, as they were the highest educational advantages. Such was the recognition and the consideration accorded the colored American, whether student or resident in Oberlin, in the early years of its history."

A relentless abolitionist, Langston was totally sympathetic to John Brown's agitations for an end to slavery; however, he declined John Brown's invitation to accompany him on the fateful Harper's Ferry Raid on the grounds that he believed that he could be most helpful to the cause by working within the law. He was out of town at the time of the famed Oberlin-Wellington Rescue, but his brother Charles was one of the rescuers, and both he and Charles were eloquent spokesmen on behalf of those incarcerated in the Cleveland jail in the aftermath of that celebrated event. Incidentally, his brother Charles later became the grandfather of poet Langston Hughes.

When the Civil War broke out Langston worked tirelessly as a recruiter of black soldiers for the Union Army, extending his efforts throughout Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Since Ohio's governor did not at once approve of black military units, Langston first recruited for the 54th Massachusetts Regiment and sent hundreds into its ranks, twenty-one of whom were from Oberlin! When finally authorized by the governor in 1863, Langston almost single-handedly put together the first black regiment from Ohio.

Following the war he served as Inspector General of the Freedmen's Bureau and travelled throughout the South visiting and helping to set up schools for recently freed slaves. In 1869 he was called by Howard University to set up its new law department. Accepting the appointment, but maintaining his home in Oberlin until 1871, Langston served continuously as professor of law at Howard and successively as dean of law, vice president, and acting president. (Records show that in the 1900 there were 728 black lawyers in America, practically all of them trained at Howard University. And it is fascinating to reflect on the extent to which Langston's hand was involved, either directly or indirectly, in their education.) During his more than seven years at Howard, Langston also served on the District of Columbia Board of Health, was a trustee of the Freedmen's Savings and Trust Bank, and became the first black lawyer admitted to practice in the United States Supreme Court. He left Howard in 1876 and joined the foreign service, for which he served until 1885 in the Caribbean, the bulk of the time as Ambassador to Haiti.

Upon his return to private life in 1885, he was called to the presidency of the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, now known as Virginia State University. Disgusted and disheartened by the almost constant interference of white politicians in the running of Virginia State, a black institution, Langston resigned after just two years in office and became actively involved in Virginia and national politics. He played a prominent role in the 1888 Republican Convention and he made a presidential nominating speech for then Senator John Sherman of Ohio. Subsequent to that he was nominated to run for Congress on the Republican ticket in the 4th Congressional District of Virginia. Considerable forces, both Democratic and Republican, were arrayed against him, and the resulting campaign was as dirty as they

come. But Langston and his supporters prevailed and he was elected, and to this day he stands as the only black congressman ever from Virginia.

He did not run for a second term, citing the best interest of the party as his reason. He retired to a limited law practice, to touring as a much sought after speaker, and to the task of writing his autobiography. He died quietly in Washington, D.C. on November 15, 1897.

While he rose to national and international acclaim in his post Oberlin years, John Langston never forgot his only true home town, and he often visited his many friends here. He was a loyal alumnus of the College and a ceaseless booster of the town and its people. In his memoris he wrote fondly of Oberlin:

"To the Oberlin community belongs the distinguishing honor of being the first one on the face of the earth to realize in its teachings, its practices and its manners towards every human being, the high Christian sentiment—That whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

As we now salute this great Oberlinian some 85 years after his death, and as we give his name to this school, we not only celebrate his splendid life, but we also honor this town, his town, the Oberlin of the 1840s, the 1850s and the 1860s. The people of Oberlin cared for each other in extraordinary ways in those days, and they cared for those in the wider human community as well. Oberlin nurtured John Langston, and he responded with a life devoted to education and to public service. If one were to write a belated epitaph for him today, it could read simply, "John Mercer Langston, tireless public servant, but never in servitude."

The Langston name on this school should be a source of pride for all boys and girls who will attend here, and it should serve as a reminder to all of us in this community that a high standard was set for us by those early Oberlinians. May we begin anew this day, in all that we do and in all that we say, to be worthy of our citizenship here. ●

IS CONSUMERISM ALIVE IN THE HEALTH CARE INDUSTRY?

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, we all have become aware of the crisis in our health care system. Present mechanisms for health care delivery and financing inevitably will undergo drastic changes in the very near future as medical care costs continue to soar out of control.

Congress took an important first step toward controlling runaway health care costs with the inclusion in the recently passed social security reform package strict cost control measures for hospitals that serve Medicare patients.

The problems of our health care system—which range from its lack of accountability to consumers to the Reagan administration's weakening of Government's role in assuring access

for all Americans to affordable, high quality health care—were discussed by National Consumers League Executive Director Barbara Warden in a recent speech to the ABA's Forum Committee on Health Law. In her speech, Ms. Warden raised a number of key issues in the health care debate. It is a particularly thoughtful piece that I would like to share with my colleagues as we continue our efforts to reach an equitable resolution to this crisis.

IS CONSUMERISM ALIVE IN THE HEALTH CARE INDUSTRY?

A resounding YES! Americans are buying billions of dollars worth of health care each year.

The health care system is the third largest industry in the United States. In 1982, the country spent \$276 billion on health services, more than 10 percent of the gross national product.

Health care in the U.S. is not just men and women dressed in white coats carrying little black bags ministering to the sick in their community. Health care is big business, buying and selling commodities and services in the marketplace with the entrepreneurial provider cast in the role of medical shopkeeper responding to customers: there are 300,000 private doctors; 6,000 independent hospitals; 27,000 private nursing homes; and 6 million persons (about 6 percent of the labor force) employed in the health care business. In fiscal year 1978, there were 38 million hospital admissions; 162 million Americans visited a physician at least once (with the average person making 4.8 visits annually); more than a billion and a half prescriptions were filled; and 5 billion laboratory tests were ordered.

There is nothing inherently good or bad about this country directing billions of national dollars towards health care for its citizens if these dollars support better and more effective health measures. But by some standards, the U.S. does not get much good care for its dollars. There is duplication and waste. In 1978, there were 130,000 excess hospital beds going unused; there are duplicative CAT scanners and intensive care units; in neighboring hospitals there are too many health specialists and too few primary care physicians. In 1977, there were two million unnecessary operations costing \$4 billion.

These are costly manifestations of a health system gone haywire.

IS CONSUMERISM ALIVE IN THE HEALTH CARE INDUSTRY?

If on another level, consumerism refers to rationalizing a health care system and controlling costs, we have a long way to go, and the answer is a resounding NO!

The American health care business is a system of monopolized medicine. This complex and peculiar service industry of diverse providers—private practitioners, hospital-based or free standing medical groups, hospital-based outpatient clinics and emergency rooms, community health centers, and health maintenance organizations, radiologists and other technicians and nursing homes—is a piecemeal system almost totally immune to the influence of the normal economic supply and demand forces. "Demand" is set largely by the suppliers.

The present suppliers of health care services are largely unrestrained by the traditional marketplace characteristics of quality comparisons, truth in labeling information, price competition, information disclosure

and informed consumer consent. Normally, it is the buyer who decides what service or commodity to purchase, from a haircut to a motorcycle. In medicine, decisions are made mostly by the seller, which places the physician, for example, in a uniquely powerful role. Doctors not only supply the services, but actually create 80 percent of the demand for health services—including their own:

The doctor decides what laboratory tests need to be performed;

The doctor prescribes drugs;

The doctor leaves instructions with the house staff or nurse;

The doctor decides whether a patient goes to a hospital or receives much less expensive treatment on an outpatient basis;

The doctor decides when to transfer a patient to an extended care facility;

The doctor decides the frequency of follow-up office treatment and how many hospital visits the doctor needs to make.

Not many of us would have the nerve to challenge a doctor's orders; we lack the medical knowledge and the confidence. The time when a patient is in distress is not the most likely moment to bargain for treatment and cost of care. Unfortunately, the physician often makes decisions without regard to cost. In fact, it is in the doctor's financial interests to prescribe high cost rather than low cost treatment.

There is little incentive for consumers to be cost conscious either because the current fee-for-service reimbursement system relies on a third party to pay medical bills. In the case of Medicare and Medicaid, the Federal Government pays; for the rest of the population lucky enough to have private health protection, the insurance company pays. Federal, state, and local government—directly or indirectly—pay more than 40 percent of the national health bill and about 92 percent of all hospital charges are reimbursed by that unobtrusive third party payer.

When the government enacted Medicare health insurance for the elderly in 1965, 20 million senior citizens breathed a sigh of relief that affordable health care was available and accessible to them. It was a short-lived sense of security because once again, the supply/demand control rests with the doctors whose allies are both the hospitals which compete for patients and high tech health care and the insurance companies that have created a confusing array of profitable and wasteful supplemental insurance policies.

Medicare drives the inflationary aspects of the health care system because hospital costs exceed the annual rate of inflation and physicians are not required to accept "assignment." Under the assignment system, a doctor voluntarily accepts Medicare's customary, reasonable and prevailing charge as payment in full (minus the annual deductible and coinsurance payments paid by the Medicare patient). A doctor can refuse assignment, and instead of billing Medicare, can bill the Medicare patient directly. In that case, three problems arise. First, the burden of being reimbursed by Medicare falls on the patient. Second, the doctor is not constrained to limit charges to a "reasonable" rate. Third, the portion of the bill in excess of the reasonable charge not only comes out of the patient's pocket, but the reason that Medicare does not reimburse the full amount of the bill is left unexplained. The elderly are left in the dark as to whether they are paying unusually

high physician rates or for uncovered services.

"Medigap" exists because of the steadily declining ability of Medicare to meet the increasing high costs of health care for the elderly. But no single Medigap policy completely fills the gap. Almost 25 percent of policy holders have multiple policies which duplicate coverage to a greater or lesser extent.

In 1978, "Medigap" policies accounted for over a million dollars in private premium payments by older people. For most of them, Medigap is a "bad buy" because of the high incidence of fraud and abuse, but lack of coverage is a risk that most people cannot afford to take—bad buy or not.

In America, the health care system knows no boundaries when it comes to the price charged for a service rendered. With a complex and cumbersome system of fees, services, providers, service delivery mechanisms, and billing procedures, it is difficult to know where and how to wedge in a barrier that restrains costs and requires medical accountability.

Two obvious places to start are with doctors and the hospitals. According to a health subcommittee in the U.S. House of Representatives, while physicians' fees account for 20 percent of the nation's medical bills, and hospital costs account for another 40 percent of that health bill, physicians control 80 percent of the way health dollars get spent. Physicians are going to have to be held more accountable for the way they practice medicine.

Change is possible without compromising the quality of health care. In Worcester, Massachusetts, for example, the Fallon Community Health Plan offers health coverage to more than 40,000 persons, and includes a successful Medicare program that pays almost 100 percent of subscribers' health care costs. The Fallon senior plan has reduced hospitalization of the elderly by 60 percent. With the exception of a \$2 charge for prescriptions, there are no out-of-pocket costs to the elderly patients. There are no deductibles. Everything is paid for including new eyeglasses every two years. The incentive is to lower health costs, reduce costly hospital care and not compromise the quality of care. In a recent survey of Fallon's elderly patients, 100 percent said they would re-enroll immediately if they had the opportunity.

The Fallon Clinic is one model of a health maintenance organization (HMO). The HMO model is a multi-disciplinary approach to provide health services in a single out-patient setting using health care doctors, nurse practitioners, and physician assistants. The emphasis is on health promotion and health maintenance.

Community-oriented primary care (COPC) is another model of medical care that is an amalgamation of primary clinical care for individuals and families, combined with an awareness and periodic assessment of the community's status and needs. There is heavy emphasis on community involvement in planning, implementation, and evaluation of community health programs. Outreach to the community and patient education are major components in COPC.

However, the current health care system in America does not encourage disease prevention and health promotion. For most American's encounters with the medical system are episodic and take place when treatment is needed for acute conditions. Planned efforts to reduce health risks are not undertaken because organized medicine

does not support such efforts. There is little status, high tech drama, or money in health maintenance or health promotion. In the absence of planned care, according to Jack Geiger, community medicine professor at City College of New York, "salvage" inevitably takes the priority over health maintenance. Hospital-based salvage is favored over less expensive, simpler care of less advanced diseases. Nevertheless, HMO and COPC are models of change in delivering health services and they are building an impressive record in reducing health inflation.

In addition, the reimbursement structure of fee-for-service emphasizes that responsibility for health care should be left in the hands of individual physicians and not to a multi-disciplinary team of health care professionals and paraprofessionals. With the enactment of the 1982 tax amendments, HMO Medicare services are now reimbursable. The team approach will require, however, a reorientation of all health providers as well as of the patient or consumer of health services.

IS CONSUMERISM ALIVE IN THE HEALTH CARE INDUSTRY?

There is a dichotomy. On one level, as I mentioned earlier, the purchase of health care services costs billions of dollars annually and profits a powerful industry. On another level, the health care system is not sufficiently accountable to the consumers who purchase its services. That lack of accountability, combined with the Reagan administration's weakening of the role of government to assure health quality controls, standards of care, local planning efforts, and peer review means that the country has slipped backwards in providing access to decent, affordable health care. In addition, there must be a stronger, organized involvement of consumers who can challenge the current medical structure to respond and work cooperatively to alleviate a deepening health care crisis in America.●

PARLIAMENTARIANS FOR WORLD ORDER

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, there is a group that has been formed called Parliamentarians for World Order which our colleague, THOMAS J. DOWNY of New York, is one of the leaders.

The Secretary General of this group, Nicholas Dunlop, recently reported on the efforts of the group to promote a freeze resolution in the various parliamentary bodies.

Because it represents a group that may have growing influence on an issue of concern to those of us in Congress, I thought my colleagues would like to see it. I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

LEGISLATORS FOR THE FREEZE

(By Nick Dunlop)

Efforts have begun to build global support for the freeze through national parliaments. This initiative has been undertaken by Parliamentarians for World Order, a new international network of legislators. What fol-

lows is a brief report on progress so far, and on plans for 1983.

Parliamentarians for World Order began three years ago by linking up members of Parliament in five countries who shared a commitment to the abolition of the war system. We have now built up a network spanning five continents, with more than 600 members in 30 countries. A year ago, we took up the proposal for an immediate nuclear-weapons freeze, coupled with a call for negotiations on a treaty for comprehensive disarmament under reliable security institutions.

As a first step, in May 1982, we organized a delegation of five prominent political figures, one from each continent, which travelled to Moscow and Washington to present our case to the two superpower governments. The members of the delegation were: John Silkin, MP, Defense and Disarmament Spokesman and Leader of the House for the British Labour party; Luis Echeverria-Alvarez, former President of Mexico; N.K.P. Salve, MP, Deputy Parliamentary Leader of the governing party in India; Idris Ibrahim, Deputy Speaker of the Nigerian House of Representatives; and Douglas Roche, MP, of Canada, PWO's International Chairman.

In the Soviet union, we met with Vasilii Kuznetsov—now acting President of the USSR—and a number of other senior officials. This was the first time that the freeze proposal had been presented at Politburo level in Moscow, and the first time that the Soviets gave official indications that they would be prepared to negotiate towards a comprehensive freeze (a position which they have more or less confirmed by voting for the Mexican-Swedish resolution at the UN). Of course, these statements from the Russian leadership need to be taken with a healthy dose of skepticism, but they do help the freeze movement by putting the ball squarely in the American court. Not surprisingly, our discussions with the Reagan administration yielded nothing new.

Following a meeting which we held at the UN on the eve of the Special Session on Disarmament, we have been introducing the freeze proposal and our proposals on comprehensive disarmament into a number of legislatures around the world in the form of a parliamentary resolution. On its first introduction, our resolution received the support of more than a third of the European Parliament, made up of directly-elected representatives of the whole European Community. It is now being debated in the Jamaican House of Representatives, where it is expected to pass unanimously. Within a few months, it will have been introduced in the parliaments of Australia, Canada, Iceland, India, Italy, Kenya, New Zealand, Nigeria, the United Kingdom and the United States.¹ This is the first time that legislators have stood up simultaneously around the globe to introduce concrete proposals for peace.

As a second way to demonstrate worldwide political support for the freeze, we are circulating a Call for Global Survival to every one of the world's 31,000 members of Parliament. The Call, containing the same proposals that we presented in Moscow and

¹ Introducing PWO's resolution in the US House in July, Congressman Tom Downey emphasized that it was in no way meant to duplicate the Kennedy-Hatfield resolution, of which he was an early co-sponsor. While reiterating the demand for a nuclear freeze, the PWO resolution went on to call for negotiations on a treaty for general disarmament under a reliable world security system.

Washington, is being signed by parliamentarians on behalf of their constituents on the grounds that an individual legislator has a mandate to speak for his or her own constituency as strong as the mandate of any national government. It has already been signed by 850 politicians on behalf of more than 100 million constituents.

In addition, a great deal can be done through an informal network of parliamentary contacts. The absentions of two NATO countries, Iceland and Denmark, in the vote on the UN freeze resolution, was entirely the work of parliamentarians. In Iceland, the government's absention was triggered by the intervention of Ólafur Ragnar Grímsson, an influential member of Parliament and a key member of PWO. In the case of Denmark, the government strongly opposed the freeze resolution, but was prevented from casting a "no" vote when legislators made it very clear that such a vote would be rejected by a majority in Parliament. This happened only when Danish parliamentarians attending the UN General Assembly sidestepped official channels, picked up the phone and alerted their colleagues at home to the upcoming vote. This rejection by NATO countries of the Reagan line on the freeze has caused what one foreign minister privately describes as "a crisis in the alliance."

In Holland, too, the freeze became a national issue after Relus Ter Beek, Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs, returned from a PWO meeting in New York brandishing a copy of the UN resolution. The question of how the government should vote was debated not only in Parliament, but in newspapers, radio and television.

For 1983, we are presently planning two initiatives which bear on the freeze. The first is a conference of key legislators to examine military-industrial opposition to disarmament, and to consider how that opposition can be reduced. The second is an attempt to persuade a handful of heads of government from middle-range powers to take a dramatic initiative for disarmament, perhaps coming forward with draft treaties for a nuclear freeze and for comprehensive disarmament, then taking on a high-level mediating role to try and break the deadlock between the superpowers. This latter project will hardly be easy. Yet Parliamentarians for World Order, with its ready access to the top levels of government, and with the ability to coordinate its efforts globally, is uniquely placed to act as the catalyst for such an initiative.

Stopping a global arms race isn't easy. Today there is a glimmer of hope because outraged citizens are linking up across whole continents.

Through Parliamentarians for World Order, a similar link-up is taking place between the handful of men and women in each national parliament—conservatives, centrists and socialists—who are willing to take a radical stand for human survival. If the movement for peace can keep growing, and keep strengthening the links between countries, between citizens and politicians, perhaps it is not inconceivable that in our lifetimes we can build an international system where peace is guaranteed, and where world war is a thing of the past.●

WOMEN AS ABORTION VICTIMS

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much debate in the Congress and across the Nation in the last decade concerning abortion-on-demand. We have, on rare occasion, even heard a little bit of the reality that surrounds the deaths of more than 15 million unborn infants.

However, until most recently, we have heard little about the other victims of abortion—the women themselves.

Victims? Yes, Mr. Speaker, the women are victims. All along the radicals in the NOW leadership have been boastful of the "rights" and "benefits" of abortion which they have "won" for America's women. But suddenly we hear from the women themselves—those who have had abortions—that someone besides the children are being victimized and hurt. Many women who have had abortions have been hurt psychologically, physically, emotionally, and spiritually.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we hear from those who have partaken of the "right" of abortion-on-demand. I insert into the RECORD an interview with Nancyjo Mann, founder and president of Women Exploited By Abortion (WEBA). I urge every Member of this body to read it, and take some time to feel and think about what Mrs. Mann and hundreds of thousands of other women are trying to tell us.

Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to astound me that so many who openly boast of their liberalism, their caring and compassionate natures, are the same ones who inflict the suffering and inhumanity upon the children and women of America.

The interview from today's Washington Times follows:

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 3, 1983]

WOMEN FORM WEBA TO FIGHT ABORTION

(Every year for the past 10 years, 1.5 million women have had an abortion. For many, according to Nancyjo Mann, founder and president of Women Exploited By Abortion (WEBA), having an abortion only began their problem. Mann was interviewed by Washington Times staff writer and columnist Tom Diaz.)

Question. Tell us about your experience with abortion and its consequences.

Answer. My experience goes back to 1974, the month of October, 30th day—the day that I killed my baby girl. It was a second trimester abortion. I was 5½ months pregnant.

I went to the doctor because family members had pressured me, had encouraged me. There was no "Nancy maybe you should reconsider," because it was not my idea in the first place, it was theirs.

My husband had walked out the door and deserted us. The responsibility of three chil-

dren was just too much for him. I went to my mother and my brother and asked, "What am I going to do?" And my mother said "It's obvious, Nancy, no man's going to want you with three children, let alone the two you already have. You're probably not going to amount to a hill of beans and you're probably going to be on welfare the rest of your life."

And following those three positive, uplifting statements, she said "You're going to have to have an abortion." Then she called one of the leading ob/gyns in the Midwest, and he said, "Absolutely, no problem. Bring her on in."

Question. Did he know at the time how far you were along?

Answer. Absolutely. He does all kinds of second trimesters, no problem.

I went in and I asked, "What are you going to do to me?" All he did was look at my stomach and say, "I'm going to take a little fluid out, put a little fluid in, you'll have severe cramps and expel the fetus."

I said, "Is that all?" He said, "That's all."

It didn't sound too bad. But what that doctor described to me was not the truth.

I went to the hospital and 60 cc's of amniotic fluid were drawn out, and a saline solution injected. Immediately the needle went through the abdomen. I hated Nancyjo, I hated myself. With every ounce of my being I wanted to scream out "Please, stop, don't do this to me." But I couldn't get it out.

Once they put in the saline there's no way to reverse it. And for the next hour and a half I felt my daughter thrash around violently while she was being choked, poisoned, burned and suffocated to death. I didn't know any of that was going to happen. And I remember talking to her and I remember telling her I didn't want to do this, I wished she could live. And yet she was dying and I remember her very last kick on her left side. She had no strength left.

I've tried to imagine us dying that kind of death, a pillow put over us, suffocating. In four minutes we'd pass out. We'd have that gift of passing out and then dying. But it took her an hour and a half just to die.

Then I was given an intravenous injection to help stimulate labor and I went into hard labor for 12 hours. And at 5:30 a.m. on the 31st of October I delivered my daughter whose name is now Charmine Marie. She was 14 inches long. She weighed over a pound and a half. She had a head of hair and her eyes were opening.

I got to hold her because the nurses didn't make it to the room in time. I delivered my girl myself. They grabbed her out of my hands and threw her, threw her, into a bedpan. After they finished and took her away in the bedpan, they brought a lady in to finish her last hour of labor lying next to me. She had a healthy baby boy.

That was tough.

I liked Nancyjo, I liked me, prior to the abortion. But shame and remorse and guilt set in—I mean, when you get a hold of your own daughter and you see what you did. She was not a "fetus." She was not a "product of conception." She was not a "tissue adhering to the uterine wall." She was my daughter and I got to hold her, at only 5½ months, 22 weeks. So those are cheap, inhuman words to use around me.

I chose to be sterilized because I couldn't cope with the idea that I could possibly kill again. It was too devastating. It was not something you go around telling people, that you just killed your baby, no problem. I was ashamed, totally ashamed.

Question. But some people would say that although this experience obviously had a great impact on you, it is not characteristic of most other women who have abortions. Is your case unusual?

Answer. No, my case is not unusual at all. People want to say "Oh, but Nancy, you're the extreme." That's not true. In fact there are so many more of us than there are the other. The emotional hurt is so deep. You do not discuss your abortion, the suction machines and the needles and everything else, over a cup of tea and a cookie. Women just don't do this. The pain is just too deep and too great.

I'm sure there are women out there who are never fazed, never, by their abortion. But I would say that 98, 99 percent of them are fazed, whether it's for a small period of time or for the rest of their life, whether they suffer only a small degree or die from their abortions.

Question. How did WEBA—Women Exploited By Abortion—get started?

Answer. About one year ago I was talking to another recording artist who was pro-life. I asked what pro-life meant and he said he was anti-abortion. I said "Hank, I had an abortion in 1974. I was 5½ months pregnant. It hurt so bad for so long."

He just about drove the car off the road. And he said, "Nancy, you've got to tell the story." So, a year ago I went public, founded WEBA.

Question. How many members do you have?

Answer. I'm a 10-month-old corporation and in 10 months I've gone from being two people, my vice president and myself, in two states, Virginia and Iowa, to now having 34 states with approximately 10,000 women in my group.

Question. What are some of the effects of abortion on women?

Answer. I have women who cannot vacuum their carpets. They have to have the neighbor or their husbands do it while they're at the grocery store, because of the suction sound. You see, the suction machine (used in many abortions) makes that sucking sound—it's 29 times more powerful than the vacuum we use in our home. The majority of the women aren't put to sleep. It's done without being put to sleep. It's heart-breaking to me that they can't run a vacuum cleaner—that's a deep wound.

One psychological effect we see almost all the time is guilt. Others are suicidal impulses, a sense of loss, of unfulfillment. Mourning, regret and remorse. Withdrawal, loss of confidence in decision-making capabilities. They feel that maybe they've made a wrong decision, maybe they can't make another decision right in their life. Lowering of self esteem. Preoccupation with death. Hostilities, self-destructive behavior, anger and rage. You can lose your temper quickly. A despair, helplessness, desire to remember the death date which is really weird but you do that. You remember these dates very strongly. A preoccupation with the would-be due date or due month. My daughter was due in early March, so in early March it's there.

An intent interest in babies but a thwarted maternal instinct. Women really are interested in babies, but I have many members who can't hold children. A hatred for anyone connected with abortion. Lack of desire to enter into a relationship with a partner, loss of interest in sex, an inability to forgive self, feeling of dehumanization, nightmares, seizures and tremors, frustrations, feelings of being exploited. And child abuse. We see a lot of child abuse.

I want you to understand that I do not come from any right to life organization. We are connected with no one. We remain neutral. But we are the ones they are all arguing about and discussing and debating. We are the voice of experience.

I told Congressman (Henry A.) Waxman, D-Cal., at a recent hearing, "Have you ever had your cervix dilated and the womb ripped open? Have you ever had tubes stuck inside of you and everything sucked out? Have you ever had needles stuck through your abdomen? Have you ever felt your baby thrash around and die? Have you ever had hard labor, delivered and held your baby? Because if you haven't, sir, you can't intelligently talk to me about this. We are the voice of experience. We've all had this done to us."

And that's a fact. So we hold our own ground, our own turf, our own territory.

Question. What is it that your organization does as a voice of experience?

Answer. We are a support group for those women who hurt—physically, emotionally, mentally and spiritually—from their abortions. We are there when the phone rings at 3 in the morning and someone is suicidal because maybe it was four years ago on that day and they still can't cope with it. We cry with them and talk with them. We are a support group. We also are a political group. I am classified as that, and I guess the strongest thing of what I intend to do—I intend to shut the abortion industry down. I intend to shut the abortion-on-demand industry down.

We also have rape victims and incest victims among our members—the other 3 percent (not abortion-on-demand). And every one of them is getting ready to go public, to speak very publicly—their full names, ages, everything. They're not ashamed. They know what happened to their lives. They became victims of an industry that is making lots of money, that was supposed to be a quick answer.

And now they're under psychiatric care, psychological care. Because of the abortion, not the rape and incest. They overcame the rape and the incest. Sure they needed help, but they overcame that. But they have had a very difficult time overcoming killing that innocent baby.

They heard of WEBA and they contacted us. And two of them were so brutally beaten they couldn't make it to the hospital in time. Pure rapes, I'm not talking about just a strong sexual aggressiveness. I'm talking about women who were brutally beaten, true rape victims.

Question. You talked about political activity. What's been your experience here in the Congress?

Answer. I testified two weeks ago before Rep. Waxman, Barbara Mikulski and a few other congressmen. It was a stacked hearing—14 to 1 doesn't sound very balanced to me. But I went in very open and honest with them, they sat very intently and very amazed at the story I had to tell about my organization, myself and my constituency, WEBA.

Barbara Mikulski said "I've never heard this side." I said, "No, Pandora's box got opened up 10 years ago and now you're just starting to see it." I predict that in five years we will see an epidemic of mental and nervous breakdowns among the women of this country. People are not going to know why and I'm going to be able to tell you why: because they've had an abortion that's why.

It's a quick solution. Abortion is not an ending of problems, it's the down payment

for a whole new set of problems. That's what it is. It doesn't get rid of them.

Question. Have congressmen been exposed to your view, the voice of experience?

Answer. No. I hear time and time again, "I've never heard this side before." "Are there many more like you?" they ask. And my answer is this. Take the 15 million of us who have, by legal abortion-on-demand, killed our babies. I will give 2 million or 3 million to Planned Parenthood, NOW or whoever they want. I will give another 2 million or 3 million who have two or three abortions without open remorse.

And justification to oneself is important here, by the way. I don't know how many women I told to go have abortions. Justification. It's like, if you can have a few more, go do what you did and kind of justify it, it makes it better. It makes it not quite so bad.

That still leaves 9 million of us who've been hurt in one way, shape or form or the other—psychologically, physically, emotionally or spiritually.

Question. So you believe that there are—by conservative estimate—perhaps 10 million women who suffered as you did?

Answer. I believe by very conservative there's 8 million who have been hurt.

Question. Where can they write or call? Or what can they do if they need somebody, such as your organization?

Answer. They can call or they can write. The address is WEBA, 1553 24th St., Des Moines, Iowa 50311. Or they can reach me at 515-255-0552, my business phone. If they hurt, if they're at a certain State, I may have a State representative where a girl can be with them and talk with them. I get so many women who have written me to say, "Thank God, there is somebody that I can now finally pour the whole thing out to."

And I'm thankful that I am a Christian because I couldn't carry that load. If you could read my mail . . . It started off where I'd get two and three letters a day and now they're wrapping it in bundles to bring to me. And I get mail from all over the world.

Question. Within 10 months this has happened?

Answer. In 10 months. There is such a need. No one thought 10 years ago of the aftermath. We're the aftermath.●

INDEPENDENT WEAPONS TESTING H.R. 2969

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, during debate on H.R. 2969, the Defense authorization bill, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BETHUNE) submitted written remarks for the record which took issue with several aspects of my amendment creating an Office of Operational Test Review and Evaluation. I would like to comment on the concerns the gentleman from Arkansas raised.

The gentleman's first objection concerns the provision in my amendment making it possible for a military Deputy Director of this Office to serve in an acting capacity in the Director's absence. In my view, this does not

compromise the authority of the Office's civilian Director, and simply allows the Office to have leadership in the Director's absence, if the Deputy is indeed a military officer. The amendment does stipulate that the Director be a civilian. The only potential problem involved here would arise if a nomination were not made for a long period of time, and a military officer were to perform the duties of a Director intended to be a civilian. Failure to nominate an individual for Director would be, in my opinion, an act of bad faith by the Pentagon, because the amendment clearly indicates the congressional intent that the Office have civilian leadership.

The gentleman's second concern, that my amendment does not create an office whose Director performs "all duties" relating to operational testing, is similarly without substance. The central purpose of my amendment is not to have testing performed by different personnel in different parts of the Defense establishment; rather, it is to set high standards of realism for operational testing, and have all tests examined against that standard. If my intent had been to create an office to perform all testing, the "all duties" clause would have been necessary. The clause is clearly not needed, because it goes beyond the scope of my intent in creating an office to review operational tests.

The next objection, that the Courter amendment leaves the Director "out of the administrative oversight for military departments for planning and conducting operational testing and evaluation, and eliminates the requirements for the Director to monitor, review, and provide guidance for all operational testing and evaluation unless the Secretary of Defense and the service Secretaries request that guidance," is unfounded as well. This is demonstrated by the following provisions of my amendment which refute the gentleman's objection:

First, the Director would be required to approve all test plans in writing in advance—without his written approval, the tests could not proceed, and

Second, the Director may send whatever observers he deems necessary to test sites, and is guaranteed access to all information on all testing, and

Third, the Director has an affirmative obligation to issue reports on the adequacy and results of testing in each major weapons program—unless this report is issued, the decision to enter full-scale production may not be made.

My amendment does include language directing the Director to provide testing guidance "upon request." If this were the Director's sole obligation, his power would be weak indeed. In light of the Director's other powers and duties, however, this provision merely tells the Pentagon that in addition to being a reviewer of tests and

test plans, the Director may be seen as a consultant and adviser who can assist in the planning and conduct of good, realistic operational tests.

Finally, the gentleman inquires in a cryptic fashion as to the "penalties for not reporting problems or failures that show up from these tests." If the gentleman would be willing to suggest exactly what he means by "penalties," against whom the penalties would be levied, by whom the violations and penalties would be assessed and enforced, I would be happy to comment on his suggestions. My amendment contains no criminal penalties.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to respond to the criticisms of my amendment as voiced by the gentleman from Arkansas. I am confident that once he understands the full amendment and all its parts in context, that he will agree that it is a strong legislative effort to make improvements in a critical area of the weapons development process. ●

THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION'S SUBVERSION OF THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION ACT IN INDIA

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently, Secretary of State George P. Shultz announced the Reagan administration's latest act of appeasement in its nuclear relations with India. In spite of growing evidence that India, a nation that has already detonated a peaceful nuclear device made from civil nuclear technology, is preparing for another nuclear test at the same Rajasthan desert site of its 1974 blast, Secretary Shultz assured Prime Minister Indira Gandhi that the United States would provide parts and components for India's two Tarapur nuclear reactors.

Such a promise is extraordinary because American nonproliferation law is clear where the misuse of nuclear technology is involved. The President must terminate all nuclear exports to any country found to be engaging in activities having direct significance for the manufacture or acquisition of nuclear explosive devices. But instead of terminating nuclear trade and demanding that India cease its nuclear weapons activities, the Shultz statement indicates the President will seek a waiver of the cutoff provision to provide India with parts, if the United States cannot find a third party such as Italy or West Germany to supply those parts instead—itsself a deplorable end run around the Non-Proliferation Act.

This latest proposal is part of a clear Reagan administration pattern of subordinating U.S. nonproliferation policy without seeking even minimal nonproliferation assurances in return for concessions which are made.

Almost exactly a year ago the administration, by Executive decision, relieved India of an important requirement in our bilateral agreement regarding the supply of nuclear fuel. The administration allowed France to provide enriched uranium fuel for the Tarapur plants even though shipment of this fuel by the United States is currently prohibited because India will not agree to international safeguards inspections of all its civil nuclear facilities. In relieving the Indians of this requirement, the administration neither sought nor received any assurances from India concerning safeguards on the French-supplied fuel. Nor is it now seeking, as it should, India's agreement to continue safeguards on spent fuel from the Tarapur reactors, which contains enough plutonium to make over 100 nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, another ominous development may be taking place. Since Mr. Shultz' June 30 announcement, India has taken another provocative step. On July 9, Mr. Homi N. Sethna, the chairman of India's Atomic Energy Commission stated that India may reprocess spent fuel from Tarapur to extract the plutonium and recycle it in the Tarapur reactors. Such actions by India would be in direct violation of the bilateral agreement and would also result in a termination of nuclear relations under U.S. law.

Mr. Speaker, the administration must stop making a mockery of U.S. nonproliferation law, and start setting a strong example for the world by enforcing the provisions of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act as the Congress intended. To continue to do otherwise will severely undermine our ability to deal seriously with our allies on nuclear proliferation matters. An early casualty could well be the President's own proposal that full scope safeguards should be required by all the world's nuclear supplier countries as a prerequisite for supply of nuclear materials or equipment.

Recently, India's actions were the subject of articles in two diverse and respected American newspapers. Commissioner Victor Gilinsky of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, wrote with considerable insight in the Wall Street Journal on India's behavior and our self-deception about India's intentions.

A recent New York Times editorial also provides an excellent understanding of the effect of the administration's Indian proposal and advice on what should be done instead.

I commend both of these articles to my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 5, 1983]

WHY KEEP HELPING INDIA MAKE THE BOMB?
(By Victor Gilinsky)

Another American appeasement of India's appetite for nuclear-explosive plutonium is in the works. Secretary of State Shultz has promised Prime Minister Gandhi the replacement parts she wants to keep the old General Electric reactors at Tarapur running, despite India's dispute of our control over the plutonium that's generated.

The State Department, which last year arranged for France to replace us as India's enriched-uranium supplier to get around the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act, has up to now had cold feet about recommending the parts export to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. State was worried about the Atomic Energy Act's ban on nuclear exports to countries that have engaged in activities directly related to bomb-making or that have violated safeguards agreements. The excitement of a trip to New Delhi seems to have resolved the secretary's doubts.

The announcement in New Delhi did not spell out how the parts would be supplied. It may be possible to get used parts by cannibalizing a couple of shutdown GE reactors in Europe, but this is unlikely to produce all the equipment the Indians want. Several proposals have been discussed for getting new parts, which are obtainable only from the U.S.

SHOULD LAW BE AMENDED

One is to have the president make a finding that, notwithstanding whatever difficulties the State Department may have, the exports would be in the interest of "the common defense and security of the United States." Another proposal, which has been tried out on various congressmen, is to amend the law to loosen the export controls for "safety-related" equipment on humanitarian grounds. This suggestion has been accompanied by claims that Indian workers at Tarapur are getting excessive radiation doses in trying to keep the wornout reactors operating.

The "safety-related" label is just dust in the eyes. Practically everything in a reactor is "safety-related" and the object of getting the parts is to keep the plants operating rather than to meet safety standards. No one seems to ask why the Indians prefer to operate the reactors in unsafe conditions instead of reaching agreement with the U.S. over control of the explosive byproducts. The real issue is: Should we help the Indians run the Tarapur reactors and make more nuclear explosive plutonium over which control is disputed? We are talking about a spent fuel stockpile currently containing a couple of hundred bombs' worth of plutonium with which the Indians have been blackmailing us for years.

Once the spent fuel is reprocessed, the extracted plutonium can be used either for fuel or explosives. The key point is that, once separated, the plutonium cannot be protected reliably from misuses by means of international inspection.

The Indians dispute the U.S. position that India cannot reprocess the fuel without our consent and that we have never given that consent. Even more disturbing is the Indian view of what happens after 1993, when the 30-year Tarapur Agreement runs out. India's foreign minister told his parliament in 1982, after Mrs. Gandhi's visit to the U.S., that "... after 1993 nothing re-

mains . . . The whole agreement just lapses and, therefore, the obligations, the duties or whatever is envisaged in the agreement would lapse automatically."

He was saying, in effect, that after 1993, the Indians can do anything they want with the plutonium derived from fuel we supplied, including using it for bombs.

Nothing stands out so much in the history of U.S.-Indian nuclear relations as India's consistency of approach and purpose and America's short-term outlook and self-deception about Indian intentions. From the start of its nuclear program, India has been obsessed with plutonium as the key to nuclear independence and nuclear explosives. From the first, India has been deeply hostile to international safeguards and the Nonproliferation Treaty.

India has lawyered the U.S.-Indian agreements to free itself of the restrictions it detests. The most striking instance involved the use of U.S.-supplied heavy water in a research reactor to produce plutonium for India's 1974 nuclear explosion in violation of a contract with the U.S. to limit the heavy water to "peaceful uses." This revelation, more than anything else, led to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act.

To bolster its demands for fuel and spare parts, the Indians have threatened to reprocess, or worse, if we do not abide by their interpretation of our agreement. At the same time, Indian has played the injured party, particularly with regard to the nonproliferation act's "full-scope" safe-guards requirement on the further supply of U.S. fuel, a role supported by some highly placed, naive U.S. officials.

The fact is that the 1971 U.S.-India fuel contract allows us to impose such changes. India agreed to comply with "all application laws, regulations and ordinances of the United States." Moreover, the Indians can hardly argue we have been unfair. We have, in fact, been enormously generous. The Tarapur loan terms were practically a steal: a 40-year loan, at 0.75% interest, and with an initial 10-year deferral of repayment of principal. India has so far paid only about \$20 million for reactors whose replacement value is hundreds of millions. Most important for India—for it was never interested in pursuing technology that would tie it to the U.S.—was that the agreement gave it entry to the Atoms for Peace program. India was the second largest participant with over 1,000 scientists, the core of its nuclear staff, being trained in the U.S.

NO LEGAL OR MORAL OBLIGATION

What should we be doing? India is threatening to blame us for further leaks or accidents at Tarapur. Let us make it very clear to everyone that we are under no legal or moral obligation to keep an unsafe bomb factory going. If there is indeed a genuine health danger at Tarapur, let us help stop radiation leaks, but we should make our assistance for further plant operation contingent on resolving the plutonium control issues. We should have done this before agreeing to allow France to supply fuel to Tarapur, but the spare-parts issue provides another opportunity. The Reagan administration is letting this one go, too. Now it will be up to Congress, though its role is somewhat clouded by the recent Supreme Court ruling on legislative vetoes.

What if the Indians threaten to reprocess, or drop safeguards? The best way to avoid this is for the U.S. to be firm. Whatever we do, the right answer to blackmail cannot be to increase the amount of plutonium at risk.

[Mr. Gilinsky is a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.]

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1983]

APPEASING INDIA'S NUCLEAR BLACKMAIL

On his recent visit to India, Secretary of State George Shultz brought a gift, a guarantee of parts to repair the radiation-leaking nuclear reactors at Tarapur. It was not only a gift but a giveaway; it undid the United States' main leverage over a country that has already exploded one atomic device by flouting nuclear safeguards and apparently intends to do it again.

India violated a contract governing American-supplied heavy water to produce the materials for its atomic explosion in 1974. The fruit of that folly was to precipitate a costly nuclear competition with Pakistan. Whether or not to maintain a lead over its rival, India seems headed for a second underground test, as judged by satellite photos that show a large shaft being dug in the Rajasthan desert.

India's two General Electric reactors at Tarapur are subject to inspection, but other of its facilities are not. A 1963 agreement stipulates that spent fuel from these reactors shall be reprocessed—a step that lets the genie out of the bottle by yielding weapon-usable plutonium—only with American consent. Nonetheless, the Indians now contend they can do what they like with the fuel after the agreement expires in 1993.

The 200 tons of spent fuel that have accumulated at Tarapur have proved wonderfully effective for blackmailing the United States. For fear of giving India a pretext for breaking the 1963 agreement, President Carter agreed in 1980 to supply more uranium. A second load was promised if India would agree to open all its facilities to inspection. The Indians ate the carrot and spurned the stick.

The Reagan Administration pursued the policy of nuclear appeasement with new intensity. When India needed a second load of uranium, the Administration arranged to have France be the supplier, rather than seek a waiver from Congress to have the United States provide it.

Spare parts to fix the leak in the Tarapur reactors should have been conditioned on India's agreeing to full-scope inspection. Instead, the Administration plans to provide the parts without strings, either from shutdown reactors in Europe or directly. That's triple folly.

First, the Tarapur reactors could not now be licensed to operate in the United States. On safety grounds alone the Indians should be helped to shut them down, not keep them running.

Second, running Tarapur allows India to accumulate more spent fuel and increase its leverage.

Third, for the United States to reward a violator of contracts would puncture the hope of holding the line against other countries eager to acquire nuclear weaponry.

The Administration vows to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, but its malleability only encourages the pressures to which it has just yielded. Mr. Shultz's appeasement has bought not gratitude but a new flurry of contemptuous threats. The chairman of India's Atomic Energy Commission last week announced he might have to start reprocessing the spent fuel because the reactors' storage pools are full.

Unswerving efforts to make India accept fullscope inspection would at least command respect. At best, they would help save

India and Pakistan from a mad pursuit, and the world from its perils.●

PROTECTION FOR THE THREE SISTERS WILDERNESS

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the long controversy over pumice mining in Oregon's Three Sisters Wilderness Area has come to an end. For over 20 years, mining claims have been held in the Rock Mesa area of the magnificent Three Sisters Wilderness. Legislation was introduced 12 years ago to resolve this issue—unfortunately, without success.

In September of 1981, 670 acres of the existing 1,460 acres of claims were declared valid by an administrative law judge. This decision meant that pumice mining could take place in the heart of one of this Nation's most beautiful wilderness areas.

I have known this magnificent wild area since my boyhood in central Oregon and I love it as all Oregonians do who love our great wildlands. But Rock Mesa is special. Covering more than 2 square miles, it is a geologic rarity, a pile of barren molten rock in the midst of Oregon's Cascade Range. The area surrounding Rock Mesa is the home for deer, elk, cougar, bobcat, coyote, and other wildlife.

When the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior met to write the Interior appropriations bill for the current fiscal year, I proposed that \$2 million be set aside for the acquisition of these mining claims that threatened the core of the Three Sisters Wilderness. Two earlier appraisals had found that the claims were worth between \$4.5 million and \$6.5 million. The subcommittee agreed with me that the Three Sisters Wilderness was too precious for any mining to be allowed. And they agreed with me that the cost, at least \$2 million less than a previous appraisal, was well within acceptable spending limits. The committee agreed to my request, the bill was passed by Congress and now the final steps have been taken to preserve the sanctity of Rock Mesa.

To have allowed the mining of Rock Mesa to take place would have resulted in the degradation of the Three Sisters Wilderness and would have violated the spirit, if not the letter, of the 1964 Wilderness Act.

All parties involved in resolving this two decade-old conflict deserve credit for saving this remarkable and unique area, and I am pleased to have been able to assist.

Holly Jones, vice chairman of the Oregon chapter of the Sierra club, said it best when he remarked that the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

action taken "culminates 20 years of persistence and dedication by concerned conservationists to have final protection for the Three Sisters Wilderness."●

CENTRAL ORGAN DONOR CLEARINGHOUSE

HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, during oversight hearings by the Energy and Commerce Committee on Friday, July 29, I testified on the need for the establishment of a central organ donor clearinghouse.

My recommendation is prompted by the increasing difficulty of thousand of persons needing, yet unable to find, organs to sustain their lives.

An effective system needs to be established to better facilitate people in need. I believe that a partnership must be formed between Government and hospitals to get a central organ donor center established. Once it is established, the responsibility of its operation should be transferred to the private sector.

As I know that many of my colleagues share my concern in this area, I would like to submit my testimony in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and recommend it to those who believe we must find a suitable organ donation referral system to keep pace with our advancing medical technologies and our ability now to save lives that would have, years ago, been lost.

TESTIMONY OF HON. DAN MARRIOTT

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the committee today to testify on behalf of the thousands of persons seeking organ donations in order that they may lead fruitful, productive lives. It is on their behalf that I thank you for holding these hearings today.

In particular, I wanted to appear on behalf of young Clayton Conger, of Rock Springs, Wyo., A 4-year-old hospitalized last week at the University of Utah Medical Center. Fortunately, Clayton is one of the lucky ones. He is the recipient of a liver donation and is now recovering from his operation performed just Wednesday, July 27. I know that everyone in this room today, those of us who really care, and the millions of Americans pulling for Clayton and the other liver transplant patients, wish them a speedy recovery.

But this week made it even more evident that it is still time that we focus our attention on the plight of those still waiting for organ donations.

The bottom line Mr. Chairman, is that our system of organ transplant is growing—growing every day. As medical technology advances, the remarkable organ transplant operations are becoming very successful and more numerous.

But while the medical and scientific communities have developed their techniques, it is apparent that the systematic organization

of a "donor bank" is trailing far behind technologies.

Waiting for organ donations are thousands of individuals, who, without the access to media publicity, do not have easy access to available organs for donation.

There are several problems confronting these patients today, and I would like to touch upon each one briefly.

First, as I am sure you know, the donor awareness program is very poor. Even medical technicians working in hospital emergency rooms across the United States are not pushing the need for vital organ donations. I am pleased that Representative MORRISON of Washington has initiated "Organ Donor Awareness Week" and feel that this is a vital step toward the availability of organs for transplant. It is essential that the medical community make each and every American aware of the life he can save when he or one of his loved ones meets an untimely death. No one individual, in his period of grief, remembers that his relative may spare the death of another living being in a State geographically apart from his. I clearly remember seeing one television documentary of a mother whose daughter was killed in a motorcycle accident, and who agreed to have her daughter's kidney transplanted to save a critically ill individual. She visited that individual not too long after the death of her daughter, and felt a sense of relief knowing that in dying, her daughter was able to give something of herself to another life. This publicity must be fostered. It is not that people don't want to donate; they aren't aware of the need, nor are they tactfully reminded of the need at the time of an accident and/or death. This is the responsibility of the medical community. They must, perhaps with our assistance, get an "on-line" awareness program, not unlike the National Red Cross blood banks. In this regard, I look forward to the enactment of Organ Donor Awareness Week. Unless organs are available, successful medical technologies are worthless.

The second problem facing individuals in need of transplants are the costs of these operations. We have witnessed many heart-rending stories of communities that have held rallies to raise the funds for upcoming operations. I applaud their efforts. But, as technologies advance and these transplants become more numerous, something has to be done. Otherwise, it will be those who can afford the organ transplant operations, who will be the ones who can afford to live. Mr. Chairman, this is not democracy.

The cost of a heart-lung transplant at Stanford University Medical Center is an estimated \$150,000. I understand that \$80,000 of that must be "paid in advance." This is a critical question, Mr. Chairman—"who pays?"

The third problem facing individuals in need of transplants is the lack of coordination between donors and recipients. It is basically a frightful mess. Management has certainly not kept up with technology.

What we have, Mr. Chairman, is a hit-or-miss program based on luck. Without media publicity, a transplant patient must wait for his local transplant center to notify him of an available donation. In turn, the transplant center must compete with other facilities throughout the United States to secure that necessary and vital organ donation.

This is indeed an inequitable situation—one that can be remedied.

There are some 30,000 Americans whose sight has been severely impaired by corneal disease or injury. That sight can be restored

by means of a corneal transplant operation—an operation that can only be done following the donation at death of a human cornea. In addition to these number of people who could have their sight restored by donor tissue, tremendous contribution can be made in the field of research.

There is an Eye Bank Association of America in Houston, Tex. It is in the process of setting up a computerized system for eye donation referrals at Emory University in Atlanta. I applaud their efforts. There are currently 23 eye banks in the country. There is one at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City. But these banks do not have the dollars to hook up to the system.

At the University of Utah, alone, there are now 50 people awaiting corneas, and the only way of securing one is to call the other 22 eye banks and hope for a hit-or-miss opportunity.

This is the closest central clearinghouse system that has been developed in the United States for donated organs. The rest of the story goes downhill.

There are many organ transplant centers. The University of Utah is the site of the Intermountain Transplant Center for Kidneys. While officials there hope to expand and can foresee transplants in the future of heart/lungs, livers, pancreas, etc., persons in this region must rely on one of the other transplant centers for these types of organs.

There is another organ transplant network started in Richmond, Va. This is called the United Network for Organ Sharing. But right now, they are established only for kidney referrals.

There are no other central clearinghouses for any other organs!

Yes, there are three liver transplant centers—in Pennsylvania, Nashville, and at the University of Minnesota. These centers are the ones that compete for organ donations. As more and more hospitals throughout the country become efficient in liver transplant operations, more and more institutions will be competing for the limited number of organ donations. As technology advances, the demand will only increase.

The solution?

Mr. Chairman, we must build a central referral center. We must have a professional system of evaluating how organs can best be utilized. It must be computerized and every transplant center and hospital in the United States must be able to plug into it. As the system will already have on file a list of organ needs, when a donation is made, the institute can immediately contact the system and non-bias referrals can be made, based on a qualified match between donor and recipient. This referral center, or clearinghouse, not the transplant centers, will become the means for determining the supply/demand question.

This is the solution, Mr. Chairman, and it should be a high priority for the U.S. Congress to address.

What I advocate is that there should be a partnership between Government and hospitals to get the central organ donor center established. Once it is established, the responsibility of its operation should be transferred to the private sector.

I will work with you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of your committee and the members of the Science and Technology Committee, Chairman Albert Gore, and the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Koop. We all realize the need for prompt action.

Today is a first step. But, Mr. Chairman, it is a great step and a vital one in meeting

the needs of our expanding medical technology and a giant step in saving lives.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.●

BELLEVUE CELEBRATES ITS SESQUICENTENNIAL

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to the Bellevue area of Eaton County, Mich., at the time of the sesquicentennial of its settlement. The territory's name evolved from descriptions in early history of the area which consistently referred to the heavy timberland as a "beautiful view." The name, Bellevue, remains an apt description of this beautiful rural area.

Since 1833, when it was the first territory settled in Eaton County by Captain Reuben and Judith Fitzgerald, Bellevue has been honored with several important county firsts. The first Eaton County school was built in Bellevue in 1833; Bellevue was the first Eaton County seat; Bellevue was the site of the county's first organized church service; and it was in Bellevue that the first circuit court term was held.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues would be inspired by the courage demonstrated repeatedly by the residents of Bellevue, in their response to disasters that have beset the town—whether it be the two cyclones that swept the area in the early 1880's or the numerous fires that destroyed large portions of the business district, in subsequent years. In every instance, Bellevue residents have come to the assistance of neighbors, family, and friends in time of need. Even today, Bellevue is a place whose residents have retained their sense of community and their concern for others. The people of Bellevue know that they live in a very special place. I am honored to represent the Bellevue area and to work with constituents who use the celebration of their history as a means of committing themselves to the future of their community.●

INTRODUCTION OF CANAL SAFETY BILL

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic drowning of 4-year-old Michael Chavez recently in an irrigation canal in Albuquerque has grimly highlighted for us once again the need for action. This is a federally built canal that is a menace to both children and

adults; and there are federally built canals in each of the 17 reclamation States that are claiming an ever-increasing number of lives each year.

Since 1967 there have been about 950 drowning deaths in these canals. Every summer brings new tragedies, and virtually every Member from those 17 Western States is under pressure to "do something" to prevent further drownings.

The bill I am introducing today creates a long-needed mechanism for making safe the most hazardous stretches of these canals and for preventing other stretches from becoming hazardous.

The problem does not lie with the canals themselves. They are no more unsafe than they were when they were built. The problem lies with their location. When they were built, they were in farming country, and farm kids are taught to avoid the canals. But whole cities have grown up around the canals over the past few decades as urban sprawl moved from East to West. Former farm lands, annexed to municipal jurisdictions, have been zoned residential, developed with housing, and are now crowded with families whose kids see the canals as an attractive place to play, swim and fish. Through no fault of the Bureau of Reclamation or the farmers, the formerly harmless water channels become potential death traps for the urban unwary.

Obviously, the urbanized portions of the canals need to be: First, fenced; second, converted from open ditch to buried pipeline, or third abandoned and filled.

Weil, one might ask, if the dangers are recognized and the solutions are known, what is the problem? Why do we need a bill? The answer to that question can best be made by explaining how the bill has developed over the past 10 or 12 years.

Shortly after I came to the House in 1969, a summer drowning in the Albuquerque Canal brought a call for some kind of action. I asked the Bureau of Reclamation for a full report and for their recommendations.

In August of 1970, Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel presented me with an inch-thick document prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation which described the entire 1,000-mile network of canals, laterals, and drains in the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, the number of deaths that had occurred in each section of the district, the proposed safety features and their costs, and a number of recommendations and conclusions.

It was a very thorough, professionally done piece of work, and it had only one fatal flaw: The recommended construction work carried a 1969 price tag of \$16.5 million and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District had already asked for a deferment of its reg-

ular payments to the Federal Government so it could correct a serious sediment problem. There was no way it could come up with \$16.5 million.

Neither the city of Albuquerque nor Bernalillo County was willing at that time to assume financial responsibility for modifying or fencing canals which it did not own. The State of New Mexico said it was a local problem, and the Bureau of Reclamation, of course, could expend no funds without congressional authorization.

As time went by, I and other members of the New Mexico delegation met with city, county, and State officials and with officers of the conservancy district, trying to achieve a consensus as to how we could all cooperate to get something done.

We finally achieved an agreement between city, State, and county officials that they would support 50 percent payment of the costs by local entities if the Federal Government, which at that time operated the canals, would pay the other half.

Responding to this agreement, the New Mexico delegation decided on a 50-50 cost-sharing bill which was introduced in 1972 by the late Senator Clinton P. Anderson. That bill (S. 3472) called for the fencing or conversion to underground conduit of any hazardous open canal or drain where the local entities were willing to pay half the cost. The bill was opposed by the Nixon administration and went nowhere after a single hearing.

Shortly thereafter, in 1975, the Government turned the operation of the canal system over to the conservancy district, thus weakening the local argument that the Government, as builder-operator of the system, shared responsibility for its public safety.

Drownings continued, and by 1978 there was again strong local sentiment for action, but this time supported with money. The State board of finance authorized a grant of \$100,000 to the city and county, provided the city and county match it with a like sum. The idea was to provide a sizable local matching fund as an inducement for Federal cost sharing.

With that demonstration of support from home, I introduced a bill in June of 1978 calling for a reduced (20 percent) Federal share of the cost. But when that bill was referred to the Interior Committee I was informed that the Carter administration strongly opposed it, and the bill was not reported.

The tragedy is that while public officials at all levels of government have argued over the share of costs, the drowning deaths have continued at a higher pace, year by year.

The bill I am introducing today takes the initiative for action by recognizing that the only entities who should pay for safety work on the canals are those who receive benefits from the canals, and that once those

entities are identified they should pay the same proportion of the costs that they share in benefits. This includes the Federal Government, so there would be no Federal share of the cost unless there is a recognized, definable Federal benefit that justifies it.

Briefly, the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make studies, at the request of a local community, to determine how best to eliminate or reduce the safety hazards of canals. The study would identify the beneficiaries of the project and would assign benefit percentages to each beneficiary, including the Federal Government where applicable. The costs would be apportioned in the same percentages and the local beneficiaries would then decide if they want to proceed with the project.

If they decide to go ahead, the bill authorizes the Secretary to enter into contracts with the principle beneficiaries to repay their share of the construction charges, with interest, over a period not to exceed 30 years.

Another requirement on the local sponsors is that the city and county within which the canals are located must have enacted ordinances requiring fencing or undergrounding of the canals to have been accomplished as a condition precedent to the granting of residential zoning on adjacent land. They must also require new subdivisions in irrigated areas to place open ditches in pipe or install fencing.

I want to stress, Mr. Speaker, that this bill addresses a problem that is not unique to New Mexico. It is common to all Western States. In fact, of the 950 deaths over the past 16 years, California leads with more than 300, Arizona is next with about 150, followed by New Mexico, Texas, Washington and all other reclamation States except Kansas and North Dakota.

It is a problem we must take care of now, and this bill is the fair and proper way to get the job done. Thank you.

H.R. 3761

A bill to reduce public safety hazards on federally-built canals, laterals and drains, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) At the request of an operating water-user entity, municipality, county or state, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform studies of hazardous canals, laterals or drains to determine methods and costs of eliminating or significantly reducing the hazards: *Provided*, That the installation to be studied is a part of a federal reclamation project.

(b) Such studies shall identify the public and private beneficiaries of the installation and shall apportion to each beneficiary the percentage of benefits found by the Secretary to be appropriate.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to construct whatever modifications or additions are found to be needed and feasible to elimi-

nate or significantly reduce the safety hazard. Such construction may include, but is not limited to, the conversion of open channels to closed conduits or the installation of safety fencing: *Provided*, That no federal funds shall be expended for construction until all of the following conditions shall have been met:

(a) The canal, lateral or drain must be a part of a federal reclamation project;

(b) The Secretary has negotiated a contract with the principle beneficiaries providing for payment of all reimbursable costs of construction. Such costs shall be allocated to the beneficiaries by the Secretary in reasonable conformity with the allocation of benefits. Costs allocated to the United States shall be nonreimbursable.

(c) Municipal and county governments within whose jurisdiction the hazardous canal, lateral or drain is located shall have enacted ordinances requiring:

(1) The conversion to underground conduit or the installation of safety fencing or abandonment of the canal, lateral or drain as a condition precedent to any form of residential zoning or residential rezoning of land adjacent to the channel; and

(2) In the case of such land that had been zoned residential prior to the passage of such ordinance, construction of safety fencing by subdividers on their property prior to the completion of the initial segment of their developments where that property abuts the channel.

SEC. 3. Repayment contracts negotiated under authority of the above Section 2(b) shall include interest accruing from the date of completion of construction and calculated as the rate equal to the annual yields on interst-bearing marketable securities of the longest term sold by the United States at the time the repayment contract is entered into. The term of such contracts shall be for a period not to exceed thirty years.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$1 million to carry out the purposes of Section 1 of this Act, and not to exceed \$100 million to carry out the purposes of Section 2.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, recently this body devoted considerable attention to a review of the administration's Central American policy. After lengthy debate, the House properly rejected covert aid against Nicaragua as shortsighted and contrary to long-term U.S. interests.

The administration's Central American policy underlines an intrinsic problem in our foreign policy. All too often, our government, whether Democratic or Republican, has followed a short-term policy without recognizing long-term implications. Our blind support for today's friendly dictatorships has often led to confrontation with successor governments. Whether it is the Shah in Iran or Somoza in Nicaragua, our policy deter-

minations have been blinded. We have looked at immediate gains while ignoring legitimate complaints and voices for change.

As we review our current Central American policy, it is important to look beyond today and to develop a policy that considers all relevant interests.

At this time I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an article which appeared in the *Christian Science Monitor*. This article, written by the director of the University of Minnesota's Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, Harlan Cleveland, provides an excellent analysis of our foreign policy shortcomings as well as positive steps which Congress and the administration can take.

[From the *Christian Science Monitor*, July 27, 1983]

GETTING ALONG WITH THE "NEXT GOVERNMENT"

(By Harlan Cleveland)

All peoples, however well or badly governed, are presently or potentially our friends. But no government can expect to be our overriding friend. It is as true now as when Talleyrand said it that nations do not have permanent friends, they just have permanent interests.

Our judgment, in each particular case, should be heavily weighted in favor of the long-run relationship between the American people and the peoples of the other country or countries involved. That purpose is seldom served by the effusive nonsense which so often characterizes the personalized diplomacy of summit meetings. This is not a partisan comment: It applies as well to President Carter's short-lived prediction of the Shah's longevity as to Vice-President Bush's euphoric toast to President Marcos: "We love your adherence to democratic principles and to the democratic process."

Everywhere, the status quo is on the way out. In a volatile and turbulent world, half a hundred governments are likely to change next year, and the year after that—sometimes by constitutional but more often by extraconstitutional process. Diplomacy is mostly the art of getting along with the sitting government. But in so dynamic a political environment, the American people have at least an equal interest in getting along with the next government, and the one after that.

What our government says and does, how and when we compromise our stated principles (human rights, free enterprise, basic human needs, opposition to communism or apartheid or trade barriers), should be said and done with an eye to the effect on those future relationships. If, to select an example not wholly at random, we encourage a sitting government to drag its feet on land reform, we can hardly expect cooperation on strategic issues from the land reformers who may take over next.

We have not been skillful at masterminding or even forecasting political transition in other societies. But the United States government can at least position itself so as not to make the unsettling of each sitting government a defeat for the American people.

In reaching out to "next governments" around the world, the U.S. has the enormous advantage of its credible pluralism. With marginal exceptions U.S. business people, trade union leaders, farmers, scien-

tists, engineers, professors, journalists, and especially students and other young people, can travel the world without being taken for agents of their government, whatever its political complexion.

By the same token, we welcome here each year many thousands of key people—leaders and leaders-to-be—from nearly every country on earth. Many of them spend some time most of their time getting to know Americans from every walk of life, every sector of society, every shade of opinion.

This "getting to know you" experience should be considered a major part of U.S. foreign policy. It does not guarantee political support by our visitors, or those we visit, of whatever a U.S. government may temporarily emit as "policy." But a healthy flow of Americans overseas, and a comparable flow to the U.S. of leaders and potential leaders from other countries, guarantees that "next governments" around the world will contain some people who understand that American governance may be messy but is not really messianic, and that democratic pluralism and nonviolent transitions of power are practical propositions even in a continental society.

It may be that the votes our senators and representatives cast each year on educational exchange programs are the most important—and the most cost-effective—policy they are privileged to make about international peace. ●

THE FEMINIZATION OF POVERTY

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the administration's economic policies continue to impose hardship on millions of Americans. Most of the road to full economic health still lies ahead. Unemployment has edged down only grudgingly, and still stands at a full 10 percent nationwide. Millions of Americans continue to want for work.

American working women confront additional adversity from discriminatory wage and employment policies. For every dollar a man earns, a woman earns only 59 cents, 5 cents less than a generation ago. "Women continue to face significant employment barriers, including occupational segregation, wage inequities, and discriminatory exclusion from high-wage jobs," says U.S. Civil Rights Commissioner Mary Frances Berry. The absence of an Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution means that women will continue to face economic discrimination from many fronts left untouched by weak or nonexistent statutory laws.

Gender discrimination on the job, in pension rights, property settlements, and other areas is depriving an increasing number of women of any economic security. Straight-line projections of current trends suggest that, by the year 2000, almost all the U.S. poor will be female—primarily single mothers and elderly widows. Adminis-

tration cutbacks in benefits going to poor women, including reductions in AFDC, child care support, and Medicaid, further aggravates the poverty that characterizes the lives of so many women today.

An article in the *RECORD*, from Bergen, N.J., further examines the special burdens the administration's economic policies are imposing on New Jersey's low-income women. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for my colleagues' review.

The article follows:

[From the *Record*, July 26, 1983]

WOMEN IN NEED: THE FEMININE SIDE OF POVERTY

(By Elaine D'Aurizio)

Women have finally arrived. The headlines keep affirming it. Women are winning seats in the cabinet and on the Supreme Court, soaring into outer space, and bounding up the corporate ladder.

Or consider the image of today's woman in TV commercials. Instead of battling ring around the collar, she's showing off her new sports car or singing the praises of her new charge card. Impervious to aging, she looks terrific as she manages a challenging career and raises model children—all the while adored by a proud and supportive husband.

Try telling Louise Adler that's the way it is. The Garfield resident is struggling to raise a 13-year-old son and an 8-year-old daughter on \$9,932 a year—her take home pay as a legal secretary.

"What hurts most is not being able to give my son a few dollars for a movie," says the 34-year-old divorced mother. "It's so hard to watch my daughter struggling to zip up pants she has outgrown, and to know I can't afford new ones."

Louise Adler (her name has been changed at her request) is not a role model who inspires other women to reach for the brass ring. She represents, perhaps, more of a reality—a female head of a household fighting for survival.

She is also one local example of a growing trend in America: what sociologist Diana Pearce calls "the feminization of poverty."

Between 1969 and 1978, the number of poor families has changed little, but their composition has shifted dramatically. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, today more than half—3.3 million—of all poor families in America are maintained by women, compared with 36 percent in 1969. Two of three poor adults in this country are women, says the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity.

What constitutes poor? U.S. Department of Labor criteria vary from locale to locale, but according to May 1983 figures, a typical ceiling was \$9,900 for an urban family of four, exclusive of noncash benefits such as medical care and food stamps.

A swelling divorce rate, job and wage discrimination, and the lack of affordable child care and housing: All help perpetuate poverty among women who raise families alone, according to a recent study by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Eighty percent of divorced women get custody of children, and authorities say they shoulder most of the financial burdens. A national survey in 1975 showed that only 25 percent of women eligible for child support actually received it—and a majority of those received less than \$1,500 a year.

LEFT WITH THE BILLS

Technically, Louise Adler may fall above the poverty line, but try convincing her of that. Her financial situation has been rough since 1977, when her husband told her he had found someone else, leaving her with bills totaling \$2,400. Other than the children, all that remains of her eight-year marriage is a television, a sewing machine, a washing machine, a lamp, and a framed photo of her ex-husband in his Navy blues.

Mrs. Adler and her children live in a cramped, three-room, \$275-a-month attic apartment. "This apartment was all I could afford, and no other landlord wanted my kids," explains Mrs. Adler, scooping rice onto dinner plates.

Watching her put dinner together on the tiniest of counters is like observing a juggler in a telephone booth. Everything in the apartment is fighting for space—small appliances, dishes, books, furniture, shoes. The frayed turquoise chair (a secondhand steal at \$65) in the living room converts into a bed for Mrs. Adler. Her daughter and son share a tiny bedroom. Most of the furniture is family hand-me-downs.

Brand-name food is only possible when bought on sale. "Fruit and vegetables are out of the question," says Mrs. Adler. "My son loves salad but with the price of lettuce and tomatoes, I just can't afford it." Even the family favorite—pasta—has moved onto the treat list.

She has been nursing a recurring ear infection for five months because she can't afford a doctor's visit. She keeps her fingers crossed that her children stay healthy.

The last six years have toughened her. With no money coming in from her husband she was forced to enter the job market unprepared. "Society is very unfair to women. After a divorce, they're put through the mill," she says. "My husband was very macho and wouldn't hear of me working. I used to sneak baby-sitting jobs in for extra money."

Trying to restore the personal confidence destroyed when her husband left, Mrs. Adler was dealt another blow by potential employers. "At first, you feel lost. I was really down on myself. I felt the divorce was my fault, that I really wasn't qualified to do anything."

A homemaker since she was 18, Mrs. Adler says she felt condescended to at job interviews: "Especially men treat you like cattle, someone who can't do anything—even though you've balanced a budget, handled all the bills, kept the house running, and raised two children."

She says her one break came in October 1977, when Bergen County Legal Services hired her on a partial CETA program for on-the-job training as a legal secretary. Meanwhile, she housed the probation department until it tracked down her husband in Indiana and ordered him to pay \$40 a week for child care. "But I'd only get a check about every three weeks, sometimes months," she remembers. She adds that she hasn't received money in years, and out-of-state officials have turned a deaf ear, despite a New Jersey court order requiring him to provide support.

Mrs. Adler smiles as she reflects on her recent past. "I used to think if I'd remarry, I would want someone to lean on," she says. "Now I long to just have an adult to talk to when things go wrong, to let off steam with. The loneliness is worst at night after you've done a crossword puzzle, after you've read a book. You find yourself staring at the ceiling and you cry."

The poverty rate is even more startling for minority women and their families. More than half of all black families headed by women live below the poverty line. In the last decade, poor households headed by black makes decreased—from 630,000 to 410,000—while poor families headed by black women rose from 740,000 to 1.2 million.

That includes Jona Anderson of Teaneck and her five children.

"If I can work out a way to keep the house, I can handle anything else," Mrs. Anderson says, unruffled by the slamming of doors as youngsters parade in and out of her seven-room home. Somebody wants iced tea, another needs her shoelace tied. Mrs. Anderson obliges matter-of-factly, cooking and talking at the same time.

"My usual state is exhaustion," she says, having just finished a full day as an accounts receivable clerk.

Holding onto the house will take some doing. The mortgage is \$713 a month. Mrs. Anderson earns \$200 a week. Her estranged husband sends her \$300 a month, but \$100 of that goes for day care. The welfare board kicks in \$142 a month in food stamps, but "my kids drink that much in milk."

If this doesn't seem hard enough, add \$8,400 in mortgage arrears. Mrs. Anderson says she kept sending in whatever money she could after her husband left 1½ years ago, but it didn't satisfy the mortgage company, which started foreclosure proceedings last September.

"I've saved about \$5,000 [toward the mortgage debt], but it isn't enough," Mrs. Anderson says.

Going back to school for a higher paying job is out of the question. "I need to work close to home for the kids, and I just don't have the time to learn a new job," she says.

Why not just sell the house? "I'm a black woman with five kids," she says. "Mostly white people live in places I see fit. I've looked for a decent place to live before—to a point where I wanted to put feathers on the kids and pass them off as birds."

"In Englewood, I had to put the roaches to bed with the kids," she recalls. That's why she and her husband pooled their salaries to buy the house. But their domestic problems were growing worse, including knockdown fights. Her husband a security guard, threatened her repeatedly with his revolver. After therapy failed, Mrs. Anderson finally told him to leave.

These days, she takes vacation days for emergencies, such as a recent chicken pox epidemic in her house. Clothes are second-hand donations. The worn linoleum floor and frayed furniture will have to wait. So will her dream of building a rock garden in the backyard.

She would like higher pay, though. "I've asked for a raise, knowing that a man would be making more money for the work I put in," she says.

Sometimes I get mad as hell [thinking about racial and sexual discrimination]. But I just don't have time to be angry. I have to keep things going from day to day."

Unmarried elderly women compose a third major segment of the poor. Nearly 2 million elderly widowed or divorced homemakers and single women (two thirds of them over 72) were below poverty level in 1981.

Marie Allers says she never planned on a day like this. But that day is here and here she is, 63 years old, living alone in a three-room flat in Clifton on \$357 a month while she recuperates from open-heart surgery.

Mrs. Allers says she is grateful for the \$26 a month she gets in food stamps and that

her rent-controlled apartment is only \$103 a month. What really concerns her, though, is more than \$3,000 in medical bills—the ones Medicaid didn't cover. "I'll do my best to pay what I can," she says. "But I can't give what I don't have."

Timid and frail, her legs swollen and her body trembling, she smiles without resentment, speaking softly of the years that led her here.

If there is one word that best describes those years, it would be servitude. Yanked out of school in eighth grade, Mrs. Allers had to help raise her 12 siblings. "I was Mama's best helper," she says.

In spite of poor eyesight and the rheumatic heart disease that left permanent damage, she took a factory job at Botany Mills—and continued to help out at home.

At 28, she married. Six years later, in 1954, when she was temporarily laid off, her husband left. "I was collecting unemployment, anyway," says Mrs. Allers, "but he was always going from one job to another himself and I guess he couldn't take my not working, so he walked out."

Later that year Botany Mills closed down, and she began working a series of jobs as a waitress and cleaning woman in hospitals and stores. She was always paid minimum wage.

Through it all, a pattern of giving was there—helping out at the Salvation Army, making coffee for church groups, visiting her ailing mother in Philadelphia on weekends.

The, when she was 54, the last place she worked for closed down and she was placed on disability.

However small and basic her living quarters, the apartment is clean. And touches of a resilient spirit—potholders embroidered with smiling faces, a music box, post cards of places where other people have traveled—are part of the decor.

There is occasional loneliness, but "I like doing for myself," she says.

The only time Marie Allers got a little extra money was when she won \$50 in a church bingo game. That day, she returned home to find her apartment burglarized and \$50 worth of medication gone.

"I'm a positive person," she says. "God was watching over me, I figure. I could have been home when they broke in."

STATEMENT ON H.R. 2697

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Taxation and Debt Management in support of S. 1579, a bill to provide relief to our volunteer labor force by reimbursing individuals 20 cents per mile when they use their private automobiles for a charitable purpose. We already provide this tax credit for businesses; we should provide the same financial relief to those who give their time and money so selflessly.

S. 1579 is identical to my volunteer mileage bill, H.R. 2697. I hope hearings will be held on that bill in the House this fall. Mr. Speaker, I insert

my testimony on behalf of S. 1579 in the RECORD and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation:

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAXATION AND DEBT MANAGEMENT RE: S. 1579/H.R. 2697

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate being given the chance to testify in support of Senator ARMSTRONG's bill, S. 1579, which is identical to my Volunteer Mileage bill, H.R. 2697.

Volunteers are a major labor force in the United States. Together they contribute some \$11 billion to this Nation measured in time and services. They are the candy-stripers, the scout leaders, the civil rights activists, the veterans, the chamber of commerce members, the Kiwanis Club, the Blue-Chip-In participants, the meals on wheels bringers, the donaters and the telethoners.

But the volunteers' contribution cannot be measured, and should not be measured, in time and money alone. We must also measure it in terms of the value system it represents—a sense of caring, and a heart-felt motivation to make the world just a little bit better. Our volunteers are working at full capacity, selflessly and effectively. It is time that we return something to these tireless individuals.

With the tremendous losses in Federal social programs there is a new call to our volunteer community to step forward and fill the vacuum. Volunteers have been asked to substitute for the drug rehabilitation programs, the aid to the handicapped, the loss of CETA, and a host of other needed social programs. It is a tall order and the volunteers are going to need help.

We all seem to assume that volunteers are somehow immune to the societal pressures that affect businesses. There are tax credits for oil companies and expense accounts for executives, but volunteers are somehow expected to be an endless reservoir of resources, money and energy.

Inflation has affected the non-profit world in the same way that it has affected government and profit-making organizations. Those ladies who work the auxiliary at the hospital are under pressure to contribute additional income to the family. That boy scout troop leader may be looking for a second job, or may have been laid off from our steel, housing, or auto industry. That meals on wheels volunteer may have to help out grandma because her Medicare costs have increased. In fact, many volunteers are on fixed incomes themselves. Times are just as tough for the volunteer as for the mega-corporation, and yet we blithely expect the volunteers to give more and more.

Everyone has become more conscious of out-of-pocket expenses. Many volunteers have to travel miles and miles to do the good work they do—driving to meetings, to youth centers, to visit the housebound. Three million of our volunteers are giving their resources to the federal government, working in parks, for the Veterans Administration, the Coast Guard Auxiliary. In turn, the Federal Government says, "Do more."

I can honestly say that I am not asking for special treatment for a privileged few, or a new loophole for some would-be tax evaders. I submit this testimony on behalf of the "good guys" of our society—men and women—who are out there every day helping their neighbors and ours. They have never asked for a reward; but now they are asking for relief. If it costs 20 cents a mile to operate a car for government purposes, it

costs just as much to use it as a volunteer. And it is time that we recognize that economic reality of life.

All over the United States right now, volunteers using their own cars are providing essential services to their fellow citizens. In my own community of Baltimore in 1980, Meals on Wheels of central Maryland served 2,050 meals every day—driving 150,000 miles a week. Life Support Project volunteers visit elderly nursing home patients who would otherwise have no visitors. In 1980, they made over 6,500 visits to people in nursing homes. I know of two patients in cancer clinics who were driven to treatment 40 times for a total of 2,894 miles.

These are just some of the examples of the work done every day by volunteers, without salary, without payment—and too often without recognition of any kind, but now these programs are in trouble. The cost of gasoline is a serious threat to the kind of neighbor-helping society we as Americans are so proud of. Every day, we learn of more programs which have had to cut back, to retrench, to deny services to needy clients—because they do not have enough drivers.

I do not want to lose the volunteer programs that are the bonding fabric in our society. I do not think we can afford to have this kind of work done by salaried employees. We cannot afford it financially—and we cannot afford it spiritually.

Finally, I am deeply concerned because the American people are now suffering under one of the largest cutbacks in government programs in our nation's history. Thousands of government programs providing essential services to millions of Americans have been eliminated. The need of charitable organizations and volunteers to fill this void is enormous. It is imperative that our government adjust its tax policy to encourage citizens to perform charitable works. I urge this Committee to take action to keep volunteers in the programs and on the roads—pass S. 1579. Thank you.●

WILLIAM R. ROBERTS ON THE AMERICAN POLITICAL PROCESS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the eloquent comments of Denver city council member William R. Roberts.

Mr. Roberts letter, from the July 29, 1983, Colorado Statesman, was in response to a statement made by a city council colleague lamenting the mayoralty election results in Denver, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

DEAR COUNCILMAN SWALM, Your comments about former Mayor McNichols in the July 8th issue of the Colorado Statesman were fascinating. They were also saddening and infuriating in part.

I refer to the frame of reference in which you remarked upon the end of the McNichols era. You were quoted as saying, "Apparently, there's sort of a trend. Chicago has their minority mayor, Philadelphia just elected one, and of course Detroit's had one for several years as had Los Angeles. Now Denver. I don't like the trend personally. We're doing away with some of the real val-

uable things that have made this country. This is just another symptom of our system going down the tubes."

I assume that you were quoted correctly and that I have repeated the quotation correctly.

It would be hard for anyone who deeply cherishes the American ideals of equality and democracy to react rationally and calmly to such statements, but I will try.

Each of the elections that you mentioned, including the Denver election, was freely conducted, and for the most part in cities where the majority of the population are anglos. Each of the minority mayors represented the true choice of the majority of those who voted.

It could be said that each of these elections became a celebration of the American ideals of fairness and color-blindness. In each instance, most of the people, whether black or hispanic or anglo, voted for the person they considered to be the best man, whether he was black, hispanic or anglo.

How could such advances beyond the bigotry of hopefully bygone days be considered a loss of values or a symptom of decline? If the ideals towards which Americans are trying to progress mean anything, then just the opposite is true.

Each of these minority mayors, including Mayor Pena, is an individual entrusted to protect and enhance a great heritage. Each, including Mayor Pena, must meet that responsibility in his own way, with varying degrees of success. Not one of these men can or should be judged by the actions of any or all of the others. Each must stand alone in the context of the history of his own city. The fact that each mayor may not share the ethnic or racial background of his constituents is interesting, but essentially irrelevant.

Somewhere among the predecessors in office of each of these mayors were other men who broke a local mold, because they were Irish or Italian or Catholic or Jewish or atheist, and their constituents were not. Were American values lost, or did our system go down the tubes when these fore-runners broke through the intolerance of their times?

Must our country be restored to some sort of make-believe racial or ethnic purity in order to retain its values or to uphold the benefits of its system? Such a restoration itself could destroy the values and the system that you and I both look up to.

If anything can be said for your comments, they were honest and open. You cannot be accused of hidden bigotry or bashful backwardness.

Isn't it wonderful that we live in a country where men are free to say such things?

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM R. ROBERTS,
Councilman, District 11.●

ENVOY SAYS RUSSIA IS NATURAL FOE

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Hartman, the U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, was in my district last Friday, visiting Wabash, Ind., where he attended his wife's family reunion.

While there, he was interviewed by Alec Dobson, a reporter for the Wabash Plain Dealer, and I found his remarks very enlightening. I would like to take the opportunity to share this article with my colleagues. I believe we can all benefit from Mr. Hartman's insight.

The article follows:

[From the Wabash (Ind.) Plain Dealer]

RUSSIA NATURAL FOE: ENVOY

(By Alec Dobson)

Don't expect relations between Washington and Moscow to warm up soon—the two diametrically opposed political systems won't allow it, the U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union said.

Arthur Hartman, the man who represents American interests to Soviet leaders in the Kremlin, was in Wabash Friday for a reunion of the family of his wife, Donna (Ford) Hartman.

"We're going to have a long period of time when relations are never going to be very good with the Soviets, because our systems are totally different," Hartman said at his room at the Best Western Wabash Inn. Dressed in jeans, tennis shoes and a T-shirt, he was reclining his long frame on the bed.

"They've been pretty cool, really, since Afghanistan." The Soviet Union invaded that bordering country in 1979 to install a friendly regime, and has since become bogged down in a war against Afghan guerrillas.

In response the Carter Administration imposed an embargo on U.S. grain exports to the Soviet Union and led a boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympics.

Hartman said the Soviets cannot achieve a military victory in Afghanistan. "They insist on putting a regime in that the Afghans don't like."

"The thing that's been hardest for them to accept is that there could be a country on their border that would have a system different from their own."

At home, the Soviet Union is troubled by a poor economy. The state-controlled system has failed to provide a good standard of living, as scarce resources are spent developing military might, Hartman said.

"They can produce good missiles, but they don't produce very good civilian economies. I don't think it works well economically, because they try to run everything from the top."

To stimulate growth, Soviet leaders are experimenting with incentives for production. While that may help, Soviet leaders worry whether they can stop such a trend before it leads to a free-market economy, thereby limiting the control of the Communist Party.

"That the Soviets don't want," Hartman said. Such economic reforms were considered in the 1920s and 1950s, he said, but "each time they cut it short because it looked like it was cutting into the power of the Communist Party."

Hartman pointed out the greater efficiencies of the free-market system in an annual four-minute July 4 television address to the Soviet people. He said large U.S. agricultural harvests are produced by less than 4 percent of the working American population, while about 25 percent of working Soviets reap a much smaller crop.

That July 4 address is the only direct access the American ambassador has to the Soviet people. The Soviet press, like the economy, is strictly controlled by the state.

The ambassador must submit the text of his address for prior approval; he is not al-

lowed to attack the regime. "I talk about the U.S. and let them draw their own conclusions," Hartman said.

Try as it might, the state cannot exercise absolute control over what its people read and hear. Radio broadcasts from nearby countries is one source of outside information.

Hartman said the official Soviet press is not accepted as gospel. "The average citizen has a way of sifting through their own propaganda to get something like the truth."

Propaganda is not confined within the nation's borders: The European peace movement is another big target of Soviet efforts toward persuasion, Hartman said.

That leads to problems in arms negotiations, as the Soviets tell one thing to the public and something else to their U.S. counterparts at the bargaining table, Hartman said.

"They try to operate on public opinion through propaganda at the same time they're negotiating at Geneva. Their proposals are designed to appeal to the public and not to the negotiators."

The Soviets have deployed a new generation of SS20 missiles, but argue that U.S. intermediate-range missiles planned for deployment in Europe constitute an aggressive escalation of the arms race.

"There's a big peace movement in Europe, but they're beginning to see the Soviet position is pretty outlandish," Hartman said.

Hartman sees a chance for agreement between the two superpowers on a U.S. recommendation to shift production away from large multiple-warhead missiles to more numerous and smaller singlewarhead weapons.

If each side had a large number of single-warhead missiles, theoretically, neither country would be able to wipe out the other's arsenal in a pre-emptive first strike. As long as the other side can retaliate, nuclear thinkers say, no one will launch a nuclear attack.

Such a major change in weapons production and strategy could not occur overnight, but Hartman was optimistic about the long-term possibility of an agreement.

Agreement over events in Central America is another matter, though. The U.S. has called on the Soviet Union to refrain from shipping arms through Cuba to the Marxist Sandinista government and to leftist rebels in El Salvador.

The Soviets disclaim any responsibility for Cuban arms shipments, Hartman said. "They keep saying they're not really doing anything down there. We think that Cuba couldn't do anything in Central America if it didn't have Soviet backing to do it. They (the Soviets) have certainly shipped arms into the area."

Hartman said the U.S. has the right to involve itself in another country's internal problems, when asked to do so. "If we didn't do it, it just means leaving it to them to implement their system."

"They think that we're out to destroy their system. The fact is, we don't like their system and we don't want them to impose it on other people."

Hartman, a career Foreign Service diplomat, was appointed by President Reagan to his Moscow post in 1981. Former President Carter appointed him ambassador to France in 1977. He has also served in Vietnam, before American military involvement, and London.

Hartman's other positions include assistant secretary of state for European affairs, head of a State Department committee for interdepartmental planning and operations,

representative to the European Common Market and administrator of the Marshall Plan.

Serving in Moscow, Hartman said, "I can have more influence on what the policy is in Washington, because people tend to listen to you when you're on the spot."

Mrs. Hartman is the former Donna Ford, daughter of the late Richard Ford of Wabash. They met while she was a student at Wheaton College, in Massachusetts, and he studied at Harvard University, in Cambridge.

A New York City native, Hartman became interested in diplomacy as he was exposed to foreign cultures while serving as a radio operator on air transport runs between India and China in the waning days of World War II. ●

MANDATORY HONEY PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have this date introduced (by request) a bill to repeal the mandatory honey price support program. A similar bill (S. 1257) was introduced in the other body.

In a letter addressed to the Speaker accompanying this draft legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture commented as noted in pertinent part below:

The proposed bill would also provide a technical amendment to the 1949 Act to delete references to a mandatory price support program for tung nuts which was authorized only through the 1976 crop.

Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 requires that the price of honey be supported by means of loans, purchases, or other operations at not less than 60 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price therefor. While the level of support for honey has not been increased above the minimum level of 60 percent since 1973, the parity price has increased rapidly in recent years. This has resulted in the level of support for the 1981 and 1982 crops of honey being established above the market price for such crops and has increased the quantities of honey being purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC).

In 1980, honey was acquired by CCC under the price support program for the first time since 1969. Six million pounds of 1980 crop honey were acquired by the Corporation compared with 3 million pounds of 1969 crop honey. In addition, CCC has acquired 38.7 million pounds of 1981 crop honey under the price support program. As of the end of calendar year 1982, CCC had 80 million pounds of 1982 crop honey under loan. It is anticipated that about 60 million pounds of 1982 crop honey will be acquired by CCC.

Furthermore, honey imports have increased substantially in recent years. Initially, the increase in imports of honey was due to a deficit in the domestic supply of honey as the result of declining domestic production. Now, however, because the minimum level of price support is above the market price and the domestic production is being acquired by CCC, honey imports are further

replacing the domestic production in the marketplace. This has resulted in increases in costs to the American taxpayer. Without a change in legislation, the continued escalation of the level of price support under the present formula will continue to increase costs to the American taxpayer. It will also further encourage the supplantation of imported honey for that which is domestically produced.

Enactment of this proposed legislation would permit the Secretary to support the price of honey by means of loans, purchases, or other operations using discretionary authority in accordance with section 301 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. This would allow the price of honey to be supported in a responsible manner, taking into consideration the needs of beekeepers as well as the potential cost to consumers.●

DIOXIN CAN CAUSE CANCER IN HUMANS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, in recent months events such as the sale of Times Beach in Missouri have increased public awareness of the dangers associated with a chemical known as dioxin. In my own State of New Jersey, people have been forced to leave their homes because of dioxin contamination. Quite clearly, its presence is not isolated.

Research has proven that this chemical, considered to be one of the most toxic known to man, causes cancer in animals. Yet, the effects of dioxin on humans, and its link to cancer, have been a constant source of controversy among our Nation's medical professionals. A few days ago, Dr. Philip Landrigan, chief of surveillance for the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), announced that a rare form of cancer contracted by herbicide manufacturing workers strongly suggests that dioxin can cause cancer in humans.

I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the Washington Post article which further elaborates on Dr. Landrigan's remarks and the possible link between dioxin and cancer in humans.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1983]

EVIDENCE CALLED STRONG—DIOXIN TIED TO CHEMICAL WORKERS' CANCER

(By Victor Cohn and Felicity Barringer)

A rare form of cancer contracted by seven herbicide manufacturing workers "strongly suggests" that dioxin can cause cancer in humans, according to the chief of surveillance for the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH).

If diagnoses by the victims' doctors are confirmed by the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, the cases will become evidence that the controversial chemical—highly carcinogenic in animals—can cause cancer in humans.

The seven rare cancers, called soft tissue sarcomas because they attack muscle, fat, nerves or connective fibers, were discovered in studies of between 3,000 and 4,000 workers exposed to dioxin. Soft tissue sarcomas normally appears once in 50,000 persons in the general population, suggesting that the incidence in the chemical workers may be related to dioxin exposure.

Dioxin, an unwanted contaminant of the manufacture of herbicides and related chemicals, is one of the substances most toxic to animals.

Dioxin was contained in an oil compound that was sprayed on roads to keep down dust in dozens of Missouri communities, and has been recently discovered in other sites across the country. The Environmental Protection Agency evacuated and bought the entire town of Times Beach, Mo., after dioxin washed through the community during a flood this spring.

Chemical companies' officials, however, have said that there is no proof that dioxin causes anything more serious in human than a sometimes severe skin disease, called chloracne.

Dr. Philip Landrigan, chief of surveillance, evaluation and field studies for NIOSH, cautioned that samples of the suspected cancers are being studied at the Armed Forces lab for final confirmation of diagnoses.

"To be absolutely certain there's a cause-and-effect relationship" between dioxin exposure and cancer, "we want this confirmation" and "we need to investigate more cases," Landrigan said.

"But to me," he added, "the evidence is very strongly suggestive that occupational exposure to dioxin can cause cancer."

Although workers for other companies were included in the studies, the seven cancers were found in workers at the Dow Chemical Co. and the Monsanto Co.

Dow and Monsanto doctors have said the findings on dioxin's role as a long-time hazard are inconclusive. "If you force me to say is it or is it not, I'd have to say no. I want to see some further research," said Dr. Ralph Cook, director of epidemiology for Dow.

Dr. William Gaffey, who holds the same position at Monsanto, said, "I don't think we can say until we have an opportunity for a longer look."

Four of the workers, all now dead, were involved in the manufacture of 2,4,5-T and related herbicides or their chemical components, compounds commonly contaminated by dioxin, Landrigan said.

The other three, he said, may have been exposed because they worked in plants where such products were made. One of the three is still alive.

Officials at the Environmental Protection Agency's Health Effects Research Laboratory in Cincinnati are examining independently a set of EPA reports saying that this and other evidence show that dioxin "probably" can cause human cancers, an EPA spokesman said.

The Dow and Monsanto cases were disclosed in medical journals two years ago. But their significance was debated at the time, because of varying results in different studies.

It is unclear, too, whether these studies show major hazards from lower-level exposures, the kind that might be more applicable to the general population. Most of the chemical workers were either exposed for several years, had massive shorter-term exposures or both.

The Dow and Monsanto experiences "don't tell us whether or not" low-level exposure is harmful but do dictate caution, Landrigan said.

Chemical industry officials say that industrial exposure to dioxin has caused many cases of chloracne, a skin disorder that can sometimes escalate into serious liver, blood or nerve problems. But both industry and government officials have repeatedly said that there is no proof that dioxin has caused even worse effects, like cancer.

Swedish scientists first reported five years ago that lumberjacks and other laborers exposed to dioxin suffered five to six times the expected number of soft tissue sarcomas.

Dow and Monsanto independently studied four groups of their workers at plants in Midland, Mich., and Nitro, W.Va. None of these studies seemed to show a statistically abnormal number of the rare tumors.

But NIOSH epidemiologists added up these populations and added possible cases reported by other doctors. This produced the seven cases under investigation, two among Dow workers, five among Monsanto's.

Information on the length and intensity of the workers' exposures is incomplete. Dow's Cook said that one of the Dow workers was first exposed to suspect substances in 1964 and died in 1975. The other was first exposed in 1951 and died this year. Both were part of a group inadvertently over-exposed for three to nine months in 1963-64 when a manufacturing change released unexpectedly large quantities of chemicals.

At least two of the seven victims being studied by NIOSH were heavy smokers, Cook said. Scientists know cancer may sometimes be caused by smoking in combination with a chemical exposure.

Gaffey said three of the Monsanto victims worked at the Nitro plant where a 1949 explosion may have spread chemicals. He said two of the three might have been involved in the cleanup after the accident. The third, a clerk, had "minimal opportunity" for exposure, he said.

The final Monsanto cases involved a father and son who worked at an East St. Louis, Ill., plant. Gaffey said that the father was a maintenance worker exposed to unknown amounts of dioxin and that the son, a clerk, was diagnosed as having a soft tissue sarcoma two years after he went to work. The son is dead; the father is alive.●

BROTHERHOOD RAILWAY CARMEN 95TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I take great pleasure in congratulating the Brotherhood Railway Carmen upon reaching their 95th anniversary. For nearly a century, the Brotherhood has been an advocate of those Americans who toil at the construction, repair, and servicing of our Nation's railcar fleet.

I am a firm believer in railroads and a committed supporter of organized labor; both play a vital part in the life of the Third Congressional District of Connecticut, and this year I have been

involved in several areas of concern to the rail workers of our district.

Earlier this year a 42-day strike occurred on the Metro-North Commuter Railroad owing to a labor dispute with the United Transportation Union. While not on strike themselves, the other unionized Metro-North workers observed the picket lines of the UTU and were denied unemployment benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by the Railroad Retirement Board. I interceded on behalf of the idled workers and saw to it that the board paid them the benefits they were entitled to under RUIA.

At the time I took office, Amtrak, taking advantage of the vague wording of section 1165 of the NERSA law of 1981, eliminated the firemen from their locomotive-hauled passenger trains. I consider this action dangerous because it ignores safety measures solely to save money. I am considering the introduction of remedial legislation.

On August 1, the House passed H.R. 1646, a bill to save the foundering railroad retirement system. The final bill included an important amendment to cushion the impact of changes in the 60-30 provision. The bill as passed will prevent deep cuts in the tier II benefits scheduled for October 1. To allow the system to fail would have been an unforgivable breach of trust.

This year Conrail announced plans to move an office facility out of the Third District, thus destroying 100 more area rail jobs. I am currently seeking from Conrail a detailed cost analysis of this ill-advised move in an attempt to embarrass them into reconsidering this matter.

In closing, I again applaud the Brotherhood for their long service to railway car workers. A free trade union movement is a vital element in a true democracy, and I look forward to working with unions such as the Brotherhood in preserving real democracy in America. ●

RAOUL WALLENBERG

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Human Rights held a well-attended hearing on Raoul Wallenberg. The purpose of this hearing was to continue to ask questions which have yet to be answered on the fate of Raoul Wallenberg. I would like to commend the subcommittee for undertaking this worthwhile and necessary task.

As I am sure my distinguished colleagues know, Raoul Wallenberg was a Swedish diplomat during World War

II who went to Budapest and single-handedly saved 100,000 Hungarian Jews from Nazi extermination. Unfortunately, Wallenberg's heroic deeds were barely done when the Russians advanced and captured this righteous gentle. His fate after that is unclear. The Soviets claim that he died in 1947 but many others—including today's hearing witnesses—insist that there is evidence that he is still alive.

Thursday, August 4, 1983 is the 71st anniversary of Wallenberg's birth. The Raoul Wallenberg Committee of the United States, which is headquartered in my district in Manhattan and which is affiliated with the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, will be hosting a celebration in his honor.

The president of this committee, Mrs. Rachel Oestreicher Haspel, gave eloquent testimony at this morning's subcommittee hearing, which I would like to enter here into the RECORD.

The testimony follows:

RAOUL WALLENBERG

Gentleman, my name is Rachel Oestreicher Haspel. I am extremely pleased to be here today as the spokesperson for the Raoul Wallenberg Committee of the United States in affiliation with the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. This is a committee of volunteer members who care deeply about both the heroic actions of Mr. Wallenberg in 1944 and 1945 in Hungary and about his subsequent incarceration in the Soviet Union. We join with all of those here in seeking his freedom. We who are involved in this work, feel that Mr. Wallenberg's imprisonment and present condition is a Human Rights Issue of the highest magnitude.

I am most appreciative that the Foreign Affairs Committee's Sub-Committee on Human Rights and International Organizations is allowing me to appear before it on behalf of our committee. For all of us who care so deeply about the fate of Raoul Wallenberg, an Honorary Citizen of the United States since October 5, 1981, I should particularly like to thank the chairman, Congressman Gus Yatron, for convening this sub-committee. I should also like to single out a member of this sub-committee, Congressman Tom Lantos, for his selfless early efforts on behalf of Raoul Wallenberg and his continued vigilance on this issue.

The Raoul Wallenberg Committee of the United States has two goals:

(1) To free Raoul Wallenberg and allow him to return to his home and family in Sweden.

(2) To make his extraordinary deeds in Hungary known, so that the name Raoul Wallenberg will become synonymous with heroism and humanitarianism throughout the world.

As to freeing Raoul Wallenberg from prison in the Soviet Gulag, let me say here and now that I do absolutely believe that there is indeed a strong possibility that Raoul Wallenberg is still alive. Based on very concrete information, it is my opinion that Mr. Wallenberg has been given preferential treatment by his Soviet jailers. Never in all the thousands of pages of testimony released by the Swedish government has hard labor ever been mentioned. More significant, however, is the testimony of a now elderly Swedish doctor, Professor Nana Svartz.

Professor Svartz was told on January 27, 1961 by a Russian physician, Professor Aleksandr Miashnikov, that he had examined Raoul Wallenberg at a prison hospital in Moscow and even offered, at the time, to allow Dr. Svartz to see him.

This in itself is not the remarkable thing; what is staggering is that Professor Miashnikov was the personal physician of Nikita Khrushchev. How often, in any country, does the personal physician of a President or of a Prime Minister examine an ordinary prisoner? Unfortunately, Professor Miashnikov later denied having told Dr. Svartz about Raoul Wallenberg and then died rather suddenly in 1965, but I offer this testimony as a means of establishing a point-of-view about Mr. Wallenberg, as compared with the ordinary prisoner in the Soviet Gulag.

Because we believe he is alive, and to help ascertain his whereabouts in the Soviet Union, we have run ads in Russian language newspapers to see if recent Soviet immigrants might help shed new light on Raoul Wallenberg. As I need not explain, this is very expensive and almost impossible for a non-profit group to maintain, particularly on the day-to-day basis that might make it successful. To aid all of us in this effort, I would like to suggest that the following actions be considered:

(1) That the feasibility of a question pertaining to Raoul Wallenberg and his whereabouts be asked of all immigrants from the Soviet Union applying for residence.

(2) That the use of the enormous Russian language resources of both Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America be used on a daily basis to aid in locating Mr. Wallenberg.

(3) That all branches of the government, when communicating with the Soviets, on official matters, automatically bring up the fate and case of Raoul Wallenberg as a part of any dialogue.

We commend Secretary Shultz and the Department of State for what they have done thus far both on a bilateral basis and at international forums, such as the CSCE Review Conference in Madrid and the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva. We ask only that the effort be more constant, as every day that passes is one day more of freedom lost to this extraordinary man.

It will perhaps be of interest to this panel to know that in April 1983, I wrote to the Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr. Olaf Palme, urging that Sweden take a stronger position on behalf of Mr. Wallenberg. I received a letter sometime after that from Ambassador Lennart Eckerberg, Under-Secretary for Political Affairs in the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs. I am submitting a copy of that letter to the Sub-Committee. I would like to quote briefly from that letter:

"... in addition to many previous contacts on high level, Raoul Wallenberg's case was taken up by Sweden's Minister for Foreign Affairs during his visit to Moscow in 1980, by Sweden's Minister of Justice also during a visit to Moscow in 1981 and also by the Under-Secretary of State at the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs in September 1981 and January 1983."

It is particularly heartening to see that the last date given was as recent as January of this year, and does, in fact, indicate that the government of Sweden will also continue to pursue the case of this most heroic Swede under Mr. Olaf Palme's leadership.

As I mentioned before, the Raoul Wallenberg Committee of the United States has

two goals. In a very personal way, I feel strongly that the second goal: "To make Raoul Wallenberg's extraordinary deeds in Hungary known, so that his name becomes synonymous with heroism and humanitarianism throughout the world," is of equal importance with the first.

I ask your indulgence; I should like to be personal for a moment. I appear before you today as the President of a national organization, but I originally became interested in Raoul Wallenberg because I am the mother of two young children who are growing up in what today appears to be a very hostile world. When I first heard Raoul Wallenberg's story, I was staggered by the enormity of his deeds. Many persons in this century have taken far too many precious lives, but I can think of no other human being who has saved one hundred thousand lives by his directed action and intervention. Mr. Wallenberg is not a media hero (though he should be); he is flesh and blood like each of us here. Our children have few heroes not created by script writers; if they are going to survive, they must all know that they and others carry within themselves the same possibility for kindness, selflessness, and courage that Raoul Wallenberg showed. Only because he is a flesh and blood hero—and because of his flesh, vulnerable like all of us—will our children know they, too, are capable of facing evil and danger with courage. We all need Raoul Wallenberg as a role model for these trying times.

Let me illustrate this with another true story that I also consider extraordinary. About a year ago I spoke to eight hundred students at West Rowan High School in Mount Ulla, North Carolina. I had been asked to speak there by two gifted teachers, Miss Libby Edmondson and Mrs. Joyce Sloop. This is a public school located in a rural section of North Carolina and its students come from families whose incomes are earned primarily from farming or mill work in either the textile or furniture factories in the area. I can assure you that extra dollars are few and far between in the majority of homes that these wonderful students come from.

I was the first Jew that most of these eight hundred boys and girls had ever met, but the response to the story of this hero who risked his own life in order to save Jews, and as we know saved so many tens of thousands, was overwhelming. The students responded to this story with voluntary contributions to the Wallenberg effort. Quoting from a letter of Miss Edmondson and Mrs. Sloop, "They wanted to be a part of bringing recognition and perhaps freedom to this noble man and decided that the only worthy means was to donate money obtained from personal effort and sacrifice."

"Although most of the students sacrificed money from their allowances, there are two contributions of special merit. Two Advanced Placement English students, Tommy Steele and Tim Webb, attempted what amounted to a Herculean effort for them. With a total absence of experience, they located a tree deep within a forest, cut it down after many attempts, sawed it into firewood, transported it by armloads, because a truck was unable to reach the wood, and finally sold the load for forty dollars. Dee McDaniel, a student who sells firewood to supplement the family income, cut a special load for twenty dollars as his contribution. We are proud of their drive and ingenuity.

"The effect Mrs. Haspel had on our students cannot be measured by the four hun-

dred dollars they contributed; there may be no tangible means to assess the impact made by this exposure to Wallenberg's idealistic concept of man and his courage to act upon it. They have perceived the good in man and have honored it. For this elevation of consciousness we shall always be indebted . . ."

I am submitting the full text of Mrs. Sloop and Miss Edmondson's letter along with an article about the students by Rose Post, a writer for the Salisbury Evening Post of Salisbury, North Carolina. The article, written on April 3, 1982, is entitled, "West Students Learn Valuable Lesson from World War II Hero," and it further elucidates the impact that Raoul Wallenberg's story has on these students.

In the face of this overwhelming response and commitment by our young people to the heroic ideal that Raoul Wallenberg represents, how can we not respond in turn? We are requesting that all State governments enact the following legislation:

(1) We urge the states to include Raoul Wallenberg's story in their school curriculum. He is, after all, our only living honorary citizen.

(2) We are also asking that all fifty (50) states designate October 5th as a day honoring Raoul Wallenberg as his honorary citizenship is a uniquely American Tribute.

On a national basis we suggest two actions:

(1) The issuance of a United States Stamp to honor our only living Honorary Citizen; a uniquely fitting tribute to Raoul Wallenberg. I have been told that stamps are issued only to honor persons no longer living. Perhaps for this exceptional hero an exception can be made.

(2) Finally, I would like to express the hope that the United States Holocaust Memorial Council will consider naming a wing of the new Holocaust Memorial Museum now being planned, in honor of Raoul Wallenberg, our only living Honorary American Citizen.

He was the one shining light in all that darkness. How different our world might have been today had there been a few more heroes like Raoul Wallenberg.

It has taken the world more than thirty-five years to truly recognize the greatness of Raoul Wallenberg—a man who acted while the rest of the world watched. The survivors of the Holocaust have a slogan "Never Again." Let us take these words and apply them further. Never again will we allow the name Raoul Wallenberg or the deeds that this name stands for to be overlooked. Never again will we allow the horrors of the Gulag to totally engulf him. Never again will we remain silent until the true reasons for his imprisonment and his actual whereabouts are made known to his family and to the world. ●

THE ARTS IN GREATER BUFFALO

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, Tolstoy said, "Art is a human activity, whose purpose is the transmission of the highest and best feelings to which men have attained." (What is Art? VIII.)

Tolstoy's definition of art is alive in western New York, as noted in detail by art critic William Glackin in a Sacramento, Calif., newspaper. Glackin pays particular note to Artpark, in Lewiston, N.Y. He shares Clive Barnes' views. Barnes, an eminent writer and dance critic for the New York Times, describes Artpark as "a festival of international significance unlike any other in the world—Artpark stands alone among festivals in its sheer plenitude of aspirations * * *. It works as a celebration of the arts and the people with an unaffected joyousness."

Joyousness is certainly a feeling one attains when participating in the activities of this publicly funded State park dedicated to all aspects of the arts. The location is dramatic—200 acres of parkland along the Niagara River Gorge. The performances are exemplary. Some of this season's highlights includes "Hello Dolly," "Carousel," "Rigoletto," "Elektra," the Hubbard Street Dance Company, the National Ballet of Canada, the Martha Graham Dance Company, the Ballet Hispanics, and the Preservation Hall Jazz Band. The workshops provide a creative educational experience for all ages and in a variety of art modes.

We in western New York are proud of our art offerings. I call my colleagues' attention to those events that cause us to celebrate, as described in "Art Offerings Help Buffalo Beat Bad Rap."

ART OFFERINGS HELP BUFFALO BEAT BAD RAP

NIAGARA-ON-THE-LAKE, Ontario.—There's a joke in "A Chorus Line" that never fails: "You can't commit suicide in Buffalo, because that would be redundant." Well, if you'll let me stretch the Buffalo area up to this town on the Canadian side of the Niagara River and almost as far up the American side, to Lewiston, I'd like to say a word for Buffalo.

In fact, thinking back over the journey just finished, which included some truly memorable experiences in New York City and at Canada's remarkable Shaw Festival, I realized that one day that particularly stands out was spent in neither place.

It began one Friday morning in a rented car driving down the Niagara Parkway along the Canadian side of the river, and right there you've got the first word in favor of the Buffalo area. A good two-lane road with green lawn to the right and green lawn to the left, neat houses with farmland behind them on one side, the great river sometimes only a few feet away on the other—it is an unusually pleasant place to drive a car.

And pretty soon you come to Niagara Falls, and that's the second reason for going to Buffalo.

I don't know what I can tell you about the falls. Or rather, I don't know how to tell you. All the glib vocabulary of the reviewer falls flat before them. Awesome? Grand? Magnificent? I'd be embarrassed to use them. This fact of nature puts in proper perspective the vaunted human ability to use language. I'll just say that if you've heard that the Canadian side is the best place to view the falls, that's probably right. Drive past

and upstream a few hundred yards, and walk back along the bank. When you reach the falls and stand at the stone balustrade above them, the western end of the great horseshoe-shaped torrent pouring over the edge is only about 20 feet below. It is a sight to put you in your place.

On to Buffalo itself, which is about 50 miles south of Niagara-on-the-Lake, down the Parkway. The main reason I was driving to Buffalo was to visit the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, which I knew to have a great reputation for modern art.

Architecturally, it is a strange partnership—a grand Greek-revival temple built at the turn of the century alongside a recent one-story long box of black glass in the most severe modern manner. But it's the insides that count, and they're wonderful. The main modern collection is in the long box, a handsome interior broken up into corridors and rooms which surround a sculpture garden. The collection is particularly strong in modern Americans and has some notable contemporary work, including a marvelous "Mirrored Room" by Lucas Samaras, a box constructed entirely of mirror panels, about 10 by 8 feet by 8, with a table and a chair (also made of mirrors) inside. You take your shoes off to walk inside and it's better than the Fun House.

In the upstairs part of the Greek temple there were some huge paintings by the likes of De Kooning and Pollock, a room of Gainsborough, Hogarth, Romney and Reynolds; antiquities; great Americans like Eakins and Homer and the primitive "Peaceable Kingdom" of Edward Hicks (the museum is full of paintings you've seen in books) and most unusual of all, a big retrospective of the paintings of the late Milton Avery, a major American painter who died almost 20 years ago and whose reputation with the general public is not nearly so large as he deserves. The tremendous outpouring of his last years—paintings of a radical, stunning, beautiful simplicity of form and color, landscapes and seascapes and figures of seated women conversing—are a kind of lesson in how a form of art can be concentrated into its essentials.

Back in the car I headed north to another place I had heard about: Artpark, on the edge of Lewiston, which sits on a bluff overlooking the Niagara gorge where the falls used to be 12,000 years ago, seven miles downstream from where they are now. Artpark turned out to be the biggest surprise of all.

It may, in fact, be unique. Created by the New York legislature 10 years ago, it sits on 200 acres above the river. It is designed to be a place where art and the public may interact, and in the seven hours I spent there, I came to think it is succeeding remarkably at doing just that.

The lower part of the park contains a handsome theater and concert hall, solid brick with a rear wall that is pulled up for the benefit of people who sit on the lawn in back. There are 2,400 seats inside. It's a classy place, and the entertainment covers a remarkable range: professional shows produced by the park (this summer, "Hello, Dolly," "Carousel," "Rigoletto," "Elektra"); visiting dance companies, the Buffalo Philharmonic (I heard Julius Rudel conduct a program of Brahms and Wagner); stars of folk, rock, jazz and country music.

There is a charge for these shows (\$8 top). The rest of the park is free. And it's the rest of the park that is probably unique in America.

Every summer Artpark pays a large number of artists \$150 a week to come here

and work. They have a free hand to create what they want and afterward it belongs to them, although some of the art, like the big steel flying platform that Owen Morrel put up over the edge of the gorge in 1980 and called "Omega"—I climbed the stairs and stood on its ultimate grid, but I hung onto the railing pretty tightly—are left in place in the park.

This year, 51 artists from across the United States and Canada have been invited to work here during the nine weeks the park is open. Opening week, the first group was busy with all sorts of projects—glass blowing and metal sculpture, fabric and ceramics, oil painting and, most interesting of all, a 91-foot-long wooden "house," with 14 modular rooms that Brooklyn artist Vito Acconci is building in a long trench on the upper plateau; its retractable Astroturf roof sections will be at ground level.

Artpark is for kids, too: mimes and jugglers and acrobats; the chance to make "line sculptures" from colorful pipe cleaners, to talk to the artists; I saw one boy with a brush, helping with a painting. There are storytelling sessions down in the green wood in little natural amphitheaters. There's even a place to fish.

Last summer, 500,000 people came.

"We're a blue-collar area," said Jeanne Gunby, the friendly, helpful staff member who took me in a golf cart to some of the farther places, this hot, windy day. "A lot of people who might not go to the Albright-Knox will come here. We have had some who thought it was a theme park—looking around for the rides, you know? But it's a place where everybody can have fun, ask questions, see art being made. We don't do any explaining; the artists have to handle the questions. Most of them do all right at that, even if it slows them down a little, compared to working in a studio."

I drove back to my hotel across the river feeling that Buffalo had been vindicated. ●

HE LIKED PEOPLE, AND THEY LIKED HIM

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of California, and particularly those in the San Joaquin Valley, have lost a great friend with the passing of John E. Thurman, Jr. Although John will probably be best remembered for his work on agricultural issues, there is no question that he will be remembered by people in all walks of life. Senior citizens will remember him for his unflinching fight for them, and students will remember him for his work on educational issues. In fact, John Thurman had a positive impact on many people.

John Thurman loved life and lived it to the fullest. And, as the following article by Dick LeGrand of the Modesto Bee states, "He liked people, and they liked him." John will be missed, but I know that all who knew John, including his political foes, will have fond memories of him. I am pleased to be able to count myself among one of John's friends, and I offer my condo-

lences to his wife, Julie, and their children.

HE LIKED PEOPLE AND THEY LIKED HIM

[Editor's note: As political writer for the Bee for 12 years before assuming his present position, Dick LeGrand dealt frequently with John Thurman.]

(By Dick LeGrand)

A lot of us are going to miss John Thurman.

He was somebody special and in one way or another he touched most of our lives.

He helped people and made them happy, not only as a school board member, supervisor and legislator, but in his private life as well.

Even if it is a time for tears, it's not a time to forget how he carried hope and laughter wherever he went.

He liked people and just about everybody who met him liked him too.

Even when he wasn't campaigning he tried to round up people out of habit.

"Whenever I'm driving along and see more than three cars parked in front of a place I go in and ask why I wasn't invited," he used to crack.

He seemed to know everybody, and once he met someone he seldom forgot the person's name.

In 1970, shortly after being elected to the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors, he walked into a restaurant for a night meeting of a government association and said hello by name to all of the kitchen staff and waitresses, each of the four couples in the dining room and all of the people in the bar, including two truck drivers from Oregon who were in the cattle hauling business.

And he knew every city council representative from the towns around Modesto when he got into the meeting room.

After a couple of years in the Assembly, his reputation for knowing voters in his district grew into a legend.

When a Democratic campaign worker in 1978 warned that the Republicans had a chance of beating Thurman, another Democrat responded, "You know John, he'll slog through every barnyard and kick in every door to get to people."

Thurman never was an elegant speaker, but he never had any trouble communicating. The people knew what he was saying, even when reporters weren't so sure.

He knew how to get publicity as a politician, like the time he fought for Lupe Pulido's right to serve her home-canned hot peppers at the former Able and Lupe's restaurant on 9th Street.

The peppers were scorchers and the health department said her home canning didn't meet specifications. Thurman, who liked to eat at the restaurant, saw a chance to help a constituent and get a mention in the story. So he headed for the restaurant, TV crews trailing in his wake.

"You just wait for the little red light on the camera to come on, do whatever you're going to do and when the light goes off it's all over," Thurman said later. "The light went on, I popped a pepper in my mouth and started to chew. The damned light didn't go out and the inside of my mouth was frying. I had to keep smiling and when they finally turned the camera off I thought my teeth had melted."

Former Gov. Jerry Brown, no slouch at publicity himself, thought it was worth it. "John Thurman can get more publicity with hot peppers than I can get from tax reform," he said.

Thurman got more mileage out of a smile than most people, too, because his smile came from the heart.

It's a smile we're going to miss.●

JOB TRAINING

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, August 3, 1983 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JOB TRAINING

What kind of job training does one give a fifty year old steel worker who has lost his job yet does not want to move his family out of the steel town? How about a twenty-one year old high school drop-out who has never held a job? As record unemployment rates continue, so does the debate about the best way to retrain workers.

Even after the economy has recovered from the recession, disadvantaged workers and dislocated workers are still likely to have trouble finding jobs. Disadvantaged workers include low-income individuals with little work experience. Dislocated workers are skilled workers who were previously employed but have been thrown out of work by structural economic change.

The Job Training and Partnership Act of 1982 (JTPA), scheduled to take effect October 1, 1983, sets up a major new employment and training system. The act provides for state and locally administered job training, and assistance for job search and job relocation for both disadvantaged and dislocated workers. The JTPA also authorizes federally administered aid for severely disadvantaged youth. In addition to the JTPA, the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit provides wage subsidies in the form of tax credits, to employers hiring disadvantaged workers.

Disadvantaged workers have usually relied on job search assistance, wage subsidies, and training.

Evidence from past programs suggests that job search assistance, while the least costly to provide, is only helpful to people with at least minimally marketable skills. The success of wage subsidies also depends on workers' being at least minimally attractive to employers. Training, though considerably more expensive, is necessary for most disadvantaged workers. The most successful federal training program is the Jobs Corps, an intensive residential program involving both remedial and vocational education. Because the participants are severely disadvantaged, however, the cost per participant of \$30,000 is significantly more than the cost of other programs.

Built into the 1982 law was a completely new program directed at dislocated workers. Unlike disadvantaged workers, dislocated workers are on the unemployment rolls because their jobs have disappeared, not because they never had the qualifications to obtain employment. A recent study estimates that in January 1983, this group comprised about 20% of all the unemployed.

Assistance with relocation and job search are the cheapest forms of help for dislocated workers. Yet, many of the workers who receive this assistance have specific skills which are not readily transferrable, and they must receive training to acquire new skills that are in demand. As in the case of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

disadvantaged people, dislocated workers have found training programs to be the most helpful in getting them jobs.

A major problem in designing any training program is selecting the skills to be taught. It is hard to ensure that skills taught match skills needed in the labor market. Furthermore, there may simply be no jobs available in a particular town no matter what skills the job seeker has, and relocation is often undesirable for workers with families. The JTPA strictly limits the funds that can be used for non-training expenses. This addresses the major criticism of the previous job training program, that workers were simply receiving unemployment benefits, not genuine training. On the other hand, the JTPA limit has raised questions about how you put a person on a training program when he's out of work and has nothing to live on.

Job training is also difficult because projections of future trends in employment are still based on assumptions, not fact. One reason for this is that the United States is the last major industrial country in the world to have no compulsory reporting of job vacancies. We literally do not know how many jobs are now open and how many will be open in the next year or two. West Germany, Belgium, and France all have compulsory reporting systems, and so they know what jobs need filling and what training needs to be undertaken. These countries use federal funds to train and retrain about 2 percent of their labor force annually. In contrast, all the retraining programs in the United States have never helped more than 0.1 percent to 0.5 percent of our labor force in any single year.

There are a number of new ideas on ways to improve our job training programs. For dislocated workers in particular, state unemployment insurance laws should be modified to encourage training and education, while avoiding measures that penalize people who are unable to work. Another idea that is gaining in popularity is the Individual Training Account. This account would be similar to the Individual Retirement Account in concept, but it would take contributions from the worker and his employer together. Contributions would accumulate while the worker was on the job. The dislocated worker could then draw on his account, receiving a voucher to pay for education, retraining, or relocation. His account could be linked to the unemployment insurance system by a requirement that he draw on the funds after collecting unemployment benefits for a certain time.

The United States Employment Service serves as a labor exchange for people seeking work and for employers with job openings. The JTPA funded the Service, but concentrated greater resources upon the need of hard-to-place job seekers. This was a good first step, but greater effort should be made to expand use of the Service by job seekers and employers alike.

Unemployment remains a major challenge facing the country today. The recovery will be sustained only if productivity increases, and productivity will increase only if we are successful in expanding job training. Only by insuring that every person has the opportunity to work, will we maximize our country's great economic potential.●

August 3, 1983

FEDERAL ANNUITY AND INVESTMENT REFORM—THE FAIR PROGRAM

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a comprehensive legislative package to provide the framework for a national debate on needed adjustments in the various Federal retirement-related entitlement and pension programs.

Over the past few years numerous reports dealing with post-retirement cost-of-living adjustments (COLA's) and Federal pensions generally have been issued by several Presidential commissions, the Congressional Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, the Congressional Research Service, and other study and research organizations outside Government. A repeated theme in these reports is the need to take a long-term comprehensive view—that is, the need for a rational and financially sound national retirement income policy. One of the key elements in bringing about such a policy is the extension of social security coverage to Federal workers. The cornerstone of this policy is now in place as a result of Congress having adopted via the omnibus social security legislation (H.R. 1900) the recommendations of the National Commission on Social Security Reform to place all new Federal workers under the protection of the Nation's basic retirement system.

In addition to universal social security coverage, the various studies have focused on retirement income goals and benefit adequacy, retirement ages, equity—as between high- and low-wage workers, long- and short-service workers, men and women, Federal and non-Federal workers, and different occupational classes, disparities in disability programs, inflation and cost-of-living adjustments, strengthening individual retirement savings efforts, and the adequacy and affordability of program financing, for example, the policies needed to avoid imposing insecurity on future retirees and impossible funding burdens on future working generations.

Those who have studied the Nation's retirement systems stress that new policies should be set not by taking narrow, shortsighted approaches to retirement issues but by fully recognizing the impact that retirement decisions have on the economy as a whole and the implications that today's retirement decisions will have for the decades ahead. Retirement policies should not create financial burdens which will become unacceptable and unsupportable by future workers, but

instead should encourage, savings, investment, and productivity in a fiscally sound manner. This is necessary if our Nation is to achieve noninflationary economic growth and stability with respect to the various segments of the economy and their related institutions.

My three-bill legislative package builds on the themes of the above-mentioned studies by taking a long-term and across-the-board approach in establishing a "FAIR" retirement income policy in connection with all Federal retirement programs. The FAIR acronym stands for my Federal annuity and investment reform program. The FAIR program sets forth the necessary blueprint for building on the strengths and correcting the weaknesses of the present system of providing retirement income.

The first bill (H.R. 3751) would bring about greater equity and defensibility in the level of Federal employee pensions by limiting future annual postretirement COLA's to 60 percent of the plan COLA increase for those benefits which exceed the maximum retirement benefits payable to new retirees under social security—about \$10,000 per year in 1984—when an employee's benefits under all federally sponsored retirement and disability systems are combined.

The second bill (H.R. 3752) in the FAIR program, first, establishes a defined benefit and thrift plan arrangement comparable to those found in the private sector to provide supplementary benefits for those Federal employees newly covered under social security; second, conforms the provisions of the present civil service retirement system in a manner so as to minimize future contribution and benefit differences for present employees as compared with those employees newly covered under social security; third, extends the accrued benefit protection applicable to qualified private plans to the benefits under the civil service retirement system (CSRS) and conforms the provisions of the CSRS and the new Federal thrift plan to the standards required under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA); fourth, extends the full protections and standards of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) to the pension plan or plans established by the U.S. Postal Service for those employees newly covered under social security and excluded from coverage under the civil service retirement system; and fifth, provides for social security coverage for current civil service employees who elect coverage under both social security and the revised provisions of the civil service retirement and disability system applicable to new employees.

The so-called windfall reduction under social security would be made inapplicable to employees electing

such coverage in cases in which post-1983 service is 10 years or more.

The third bill (H.R. 3753) would bring greater long-term stability to the financing of all Federal retirement plans, including social security, by providing a mechanism for limiting future annual postretirement benefit increases (COLA's) to the lesser of the increase in national wages or the increase in the consumer price index (or other automatic COLA mechanism currently applicable in the plan).

EXPLANATION OF FAIR

H.R. 3751—COLA EQUITY

The patchwork structure of Federal pension programs has come under more intense scrutiny in the last decade as the growing costs of these programs have become amplified as a result of high and, at times, double-digit inflation. Both civilian and military pensions have been broadly criticized as being overgenerous and unaffordable. A recent Washington Post editorial, "Facts About Federal Pensions," summarizes that "Federal pensions cost so much because they have two features unmatched in the private sector—retirement at age 55 and full inflation protection."

This bill is intended to bring about greater equity and defensibility in the level of Federal employee pensions by limiting post-1983 retirement cost-of-living adjustments (COLA's) to 60 percent of the COLA increase for those benefits exceeding the level of the maximum retirement benefits payable to a new retiree under social security—about \$10,000 per year in 1984—when an employee's benefits under all federally sponsored retirement and disability systems are combined.

The criticisms of Federal military and civilian pensions—and, therefore, of Federal employees generally—will continue until the faults in the basic design of the present system are corrected. The COLA equity bill takes a major step in making the necessary corrections at least with respect to retirement COLA's. Other provisions in my FAIR legislative package will help correct other inequities related to early retirement, and short-service penalties which at present particularly disadvantage low-paid workers and women.

The fact that retirees under present law can draw combined military and civilian retirement income of \$25,000, \$35,000, \$45,000, \$55,000—even in rare cases over \$60,000—and still receive full COLA's equal to 100 percent of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) is as much an affront to just plain good sense as it is to the already overburdened Federal taxpayer. The uncapped COLA has created an embarrassment of riches to the minority of Federal retirees who have become well heeled as a result of the present inequity.

It is clear that the current structure is in need of change when retirees can ultimately draw more in retirement than their on-the-job replacements will earn while working. The present COLA formulation leading to this result has also dramatically increased the spread in the dollar amount of pensions which employees retiring at different pay levels initially receive. This built-in "rich get richer" principle can be illustrated—when considering past double-digit rates of inflation—by comparing first, the \$100 per month increase accruing to the typical retiree with, second, the \$6,000 per year increase—equal to one-half of the total pension of the average retiree—going to the fortunate few drawing \$60,000 Federal pensions.

If the provisions of H.R. 3751 had been in effect in the past, the spread between high- and moderate-income retirees would have been kept more in check and the retirement income of Federal employees retiring with long service and above average wages would not have spurted ahead of the earned income of their counterparts in the active work force. The provisions of the bill are prospective in application, would reduce no retiree's pension, but would serve to moderate future benefit increases for those persons retiring at above average wage levels.

The Christian Science Monitor in its editorial "Rethink Federal Pensions" states that "retirement inequities between the public and private sectors should no longer be tolerated." The provisions of H.R. 3751 would bring the COLA's under the current Federal systems more in line with leading private pension fund practices. The present cost-of-living adjustments—equivalent to the 100-percent CPI adjustment found under social security—on combined pensions under the social security maximum retirement benefit level are maintained. To do otherwise would place Federal retirees in a less advantageous position than persons receiving social security alone. However, pensions above the social security maximum retirement benefit level would be adjusted at 60 percent of their former rate. This is only fair inasmuch as the average cost-of-living wage increase agreed upon in private sector collective bargaining has averaged about 60 percent of the increase in the CPI. Many private and State and local government retirement systems which do have automatic postretirement COLA's cap such increases at 3 to 60 percent is the percentage benefits would increase under such plans if a long-term inflation rate of 5 percent is assumed.

In addition to restoring a measure of equity in the pensions of Federal workers as compared with non-Federal workers, the 60 percent COLA provision would aid greatly in controlling

the rapidly escalating unfunded liabilities among the various Federal pension systems. As a result of legislation which I authored (Public Law 95-595) a more realistic actuarial assessment of all Federal retirement systems is now possible. The ERISA-like annual financial reports required of all Federal plans show that their combined unfunded liabilities (exclusive of social security) exceeds \$1 trillion, a debt which will have to be paid but which is in addition to the already recorded trillion-dollar-plus national debt. Over \$100 billion of this pension debt has been created in just the past few years under the civil service retirement system alone. Introducing the 60 percent COLA escalator factor will help in controlling the level of future unfunded liabilities and help restore the public support that is required if the taxes necessary to fund future benefits are to be supplied in sufficient quantity to meet full expectations.

The Christian Science Monitor summarizes the issue well:

In calling for federal pension reform, we are not suggesting that federal (employees) be in any way disadvantaged or financially penalized. What is paramount, rather, is that public employment not be made the vehicle for special advantages denied Americans as a whole and thus be regarded as a source of easy income because the American taxpayer pays for it.

My proposal to limit future COLA increases on benefit levels above the social security retirement maximum takes a necessary step in removing the above mentioned unfair advantages of Federal versus non-Federal workers and would help restore a new measure of financial health to the major Federal civilian and military retirement systems.

H.R. 3752—THE FEDERAL ANNUITY AND INVESTMENT REFORM ACT (FAIR)

The reports of the Presidential commissions, and other groups that have studied pension and retirement issues over the past few years have suggested major changes in Federal retirement policies. With the inclusion of new Federal workers under social security beginning in 1984, it is now time to move forward with legislation to bring about a more rational and defensible retirement structure for all Federal workers, both new and old.

As a leading supporter of the private pension system and ERISA standards, I believe much can be learned from the private system in constructing a reasonable and financially sound Federal retirement structure. It is from this background that I have developed a comprehensive legislative program, the Federal Annuity and Investment Reform Act (or FAIR).

In brief the FAIR program, first, establishes a defined benefit and thrift plan arrangement comparable to those found in the private sector to provide supplementary benefits for those Fed-

eral employees newly covered under social security, second, conforms the provisions of the present civil service retirement and disability system to minimize future differences in contributions and benefits for present employees as compared with those newly covered under social security, third, extends the accrued benefit protection applicable to qualified private plans to the benefits under the civil service retirement system (CSRS), and conforms the provisions of the CSRS and the new Federal thrift plan to the standards required under ERISA (the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974), and fourth, provides for the voluntary election by current Federal workers to be covered under social security and the provisions of the CSRS and Federal thrift plan applicable to new employees.

The objectives of the FAIR program are consistent with those set forth in the March 1980 report of the universal social security coverage study group (chaired by Joseph W. Bartlett) which also studied retirement options for Federal employees covered under social security. The following objectives are also fully compatible with the views expressed by the Speaker, THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, WILLIAM D. FORD, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, in their February 18, 1983 Dear Colleague letter dealing with social security coverage and the future changes to the civil service retirement system necessitated by social security coverage.

The purposes and objectives of FAIR are:

First, to provide Federal employees with a supplemental staff retirement program coordinated with social security which is comparable to good retirement programs operated by major employers in the private and State and local government sectors in order, first, that the Federal Government will remain competitive with other employers with which it must compete for qualified employees, and second, that retirement program and social security benefits combined will provide a reasonable level of benefit adequacy at all preretirement income levels;

Second, to provide Federal employees with enhanced portability of retirement benefits which will permit greater flexibility in retirement planning and which will instill in the system a greater measure of equity as between short-service and long-service employees;

Third, to strengthen the financing of the civil service retirement and disability system by maintaining the one system for both old and new employees, by requiring full dynamic normal costs to be contributed on behalf of new employees as well as current employees, by requiring full employer

contributions to amortize the initial unfunded liability over 40 years as a level percentage of payroll, and by providing the opportunity for enhanced investment earnings of the system;

Fourth, to assure Federal employees that their accrued pension benefits will not be diminished by extending to the civil service retirement and disability system the requirement added by ERISA which prohibits private pension plans from reducing accrued pension benefits;

Fifth, to encourage individual retirement savings and to promote flexibility in retirement planning by providing to all Federal employees access to individual thrift retirement accounts (TRA's) in which they have a free market choice of investment and in which there is 100 percent immediate vesting of employee contributions and for new employees employer matching contributions up to 3 percent of basic pay;

Sixth, to restore the defensibility of Federal employee retirement benefits and maintain the affordability of the civil service retirement and disability system by providing for a more rational benefit structure, particularly as it relates to early retirement and postretirement COLA's;

Seventh, to provide a revised retirement program structure which is not disruptive to the present system of providing benefits, which is relatively simple to administer, and which is easily understood by employees; and

Eighth, to provide for comparability between the retirement system features (taking into account social security, civil service retirement, and the new Federal thrift plan) for old and new employees with respect to; first, contributions made by and benefits received by such old and new employees, and second, the employer normal costs for all retirement and disability benefits computed on a dynamic basis for such old and new employees.

As a result of FAIR, an additional, direct benefit will accrue to the financial health of the social security old age, survivors, and disability trust funds. Since current employees may make an irrevocable election to come under both social security and the provisions of the CSRS and Federal thrift plan applicable to new employees, an additional employee and employer contribution of 5.7 percent of pay for each employee making the election will be made to the social security trust funds beginning in 1984. A high percentage of current employees can be expected to make the election on account of the following considerations—the combined contribution rate for employees earning in excess of the social security maximum taxable wage base would be somewhat less than their current 7 percent rate, so-

called windfall social security reductions would be restored for current employees covered under the new system for 10 years or more, in most cases disability benefit levels would be increased, portability under social security would be available, the 3 percent employer matching contribution under the Federal Thrift Plan would be available, the new social security leveling option would be available, and all benefits already accrued would be protected.

In general, enactment of the FAIR program will enhance the financial soundness of both the social security and civil service retirement trust funds and will instill into the system of Federal benefits new elements of equity, comparability, portability, and affordability.

TITLE I OF FAIR—FEDERAL THRIFT PLAN

In designing a new supplemental retirement program for Federal employees newly covered under social security, both defined contribution and defined benefit approaches were considered (the present CSRS is of the defined benefit type). Neither approach standing alone was considered adequate to simultaneously meet the many objectives outlined above. In addition a defined benefit plan (if it is to meet ERISA standards) cannot, because of the redistributive aspects of social security, be devised to totally replicate current CSRS benefit replacement levels in every individual circumstance. A combination of both approaches, however, was found to provide the necessary mix of benefit adequacy, equity, flexibility, portability, and affordability.

The Federal Thrift Plan acting as a defined contribution supplement to social security and the basic defined benefit civil service retirement arrangement provides:

First, flexibility in retirement planning—for example, funds for earlier retirement or COLA supplementation;

Second, individual incentive for savings and capital accumulation;

Third, a source of funds for auto, mortgage, and educational loans;

Fourth, individual employee choice in selecting investment and annuity programs offered by qualified financial institutions, and

Fifth, portability—through permitted rollover of employee contributions and employer distributions from the civil service and other pension plans, and the continued investment by the individual of Thrift Retirement account accumulations after the termination of Federal employment.

TITLE I—FEDERAL THRIFT PLAN

Title I of the FAIR Act adds new Subchapter IV, Sections 8361 through 8370—the provisions of the Federal Thrift Plan—to Title 5, U.S.C.

Section 8361—Coverage and definitions

The employees and officials in all branches and agencies of the Federal Gov-

ernment (including civilian, foreign, postal, judicial, congressional, and military service) are immediately eligible to participate on a voluntary basis in the Federal Thrift Plan (FTP). The one exception to the general coverage rule excludes employees already covered under similar defined contribution plans (for example, employees participating in the defined contribution plans maintained by the Federal Reserve Board and the Smithsonian Institution).

Under the rules establishing the Federal Thrift Plan, plan participants may establish one or more Thrift Retirement Accounts (TRAs) in a "qualified investment program" maintained by an "investment or financial institution".

Employees who participate in the Federal Thrift Plan by establishing and contributing to Thrift Retirement Accounts (TRAs) during their working years continue, even after termination of federal employment, to be considered plan "participants" who direct the investments in their TRAs. Upon the death of a participant who was maintaining one or more TRAs who was an active or separated employee, the designated beneficiary with respect to each TRA is given the same status as a "participant" who may elect to continue such TRAs and direct the investments in such accounts (or, in the alternative elect a lump-sum or survivor annuity).

The establishment of the Federal Thrift Plan is provided for under section 8362.

Section 8363—Contributions and transfers among TRAs

Annual employee contributions: Employee participants may contribute up to 10% of basic pay each year to Thrift Retirement Accounts of their choosing. Employing agencies would deduct from basic pay the amount or percentage of pay elected by the employee to be withheld and transmit such amounts to the TRA designated by the employee. Employees could change their TRA designation once a year (or more often if permitted by regulations).

"Catch-up contributions": As permitted under current law applicable to private plans, employees who do not make the full 10% contribution in a year may make the balance of such contributions in any later year.

Federal employer contributions: Each year the employing agency will match on a dollar for dollar basis the actual amount of employee contributions made in such year, up to a maximum amount equal to 3% of the basic pay of such employee. Employees newly covered under Social Security (termed post-83 employees) and current employees electing post-83 status are eligible for matching employer contributions. Employees newly hired or employed after a break-in-service become eligible for matching employer contributions after completing one year of service. Employing agencies transmit the matching contributions to the TRA then currently designated by the employee. The employee has an immediate and fully vested interest in the amount of employer contributions made to his or her account.

"Rollovers" among TRAs: A plan participant while designating only one TRA at any one time to receive employee and employer contributions, may establish one or more additional TRAs and transfer some or all of the amounts in any TRA to any other TRA. For example, a participant might initially designate a particular "money fund" as the TRA to receive employee and employer contributions and periodically transfer amounts

in such an account to other TRA programs (e.g. involving stocks, bonds, certificate of deposits, mortgages, annuities or other forms of investment) offered by the same or another financial institution. From time to time the participant may wish to transfer funds for a TRA which allows the employee to make a home, automobile, or educational loan within the guidelines set forth under the Federal Thrift Plan. At retirement the participant may wish to rollover his or her Thrift Retirement accumulations into a TRA offering a fixed or variable annuity.

While the terms of the Federal Thrift Plan do not restrict the number of TRAs a participant may maintain or the timing or frequency of transfers among a participant's accounts, the financial institution offering a TRA program is not prohibited from establishing such restrictions or instituting penalties for early withdrawal or transfer.

"Rollovers" from other plans: Lump sum distributions to Federal Thrift Plan participants from other tax-qualified private or governmental pension, profit-sharing, Thrift, etc., plans may be transferred and deposited to the credit of a TRA selected by the participant. If an employee who separates from Federal service elects to withdraw his or her accumulated employee contributions from the defined-benefit Civil Service Retirement and Disability System, the total amount of such accumulation is automatically transferred to a Thrift Retirement Account of the employee's own choosing. The availability of these rollover provisions afford employees with a new means of pension portability and a deferral of taxes on such accumulations until later distributed.

Section 8364—Information to participants

The Board of the Federal Thrift Plan is required to prescribe regulations under which participants would be allowed to receive information about the particulars of Thrift Retirement programs offered by the various financial institutions in order that such persons may make informed investment choices among such programs.

Section 8365—Qualified investment programs

In order for a TRA program offered by an "investment or financial institution" to be eligible as a "qualified investment program" under the Federal Thrift Plan, it must meet the following requirements. First, the program must be operated in accordance with the ERISA exclusive purpose rule of providing benefits to participants and beneficiaries and defraying reasonable administrative expenses.

Second, the program must meet any participant safeguards set forth in regulations, including the ERISA fiduciary standards requiring prudence and prohibiting self-dealing. The following fiduciary and enforcement provisions of ERISA are incorporated and made applicable to the Federal Thrift Plan by reference (sections 401(b), 404, 405, 406(b), 408, 409, 410, 413, 504, and 502(a)(1)(B), (a)(2), (a)(3), (a)(5), (e), (f), (h), (i), (k)).

Third, participating financial institutions must at least annually provide participants with information on the status of their TRAs (the Board also has authority to receive such information, generally in summary form for all TRAs maintained by each participating financial institution).

Fourth, participating financial institutions would be required to provide participants with ERISA-like "summary plan descriptions" which describe the general features of the Federal Thrift Plan and the

particular features of the TRA programs offered by such an institution.

Fifth, participating financial institutions are prohibited from distributing amounts to participants unless (1) the participant is eligible for disability or retirement benefits under another Federal Government pension plan or workers compensation program, (2) the participant has been separated from federal service for at least 31 days, or (3) the participant has attained age 59½. Upon the death of a participant, the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries are eligible to receive distributions from the participant's TRAs. Regulations of the Board would provide for procedures by which participants and beneficiaries would obtain written evidence of their eligibility for TRA distributions which in turn could be presented to and automatically accepted by the financial institution from which a distribution is requested.

Financial institutions offering qualified investment programs may (but are not required to) provide loans to participants from their thrift accounts for purposes of, (1) purchasing an automobile, (2) making a down payment on a home or a home improvement, (3) meeting the educational expenses of any member of the family, (4) meeting general expenses in the case of hardship, or for any other purpose if the participant is otherwise eligible for a cash distribution (e.g. in the event of retirement, disability, separation, or death). In order to encourage the maintenance of TRAs basically for retirement purposes, the amount of a loan is limited (1) to the amount of the employee's own contributions and (2) with respect to employer contributions and investment earnings, to the tax-qualified plan limits described in section 72(p)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code (i.e. \$50,000 loan limit with the requirement of a 5 year repayment schedule, except in the case of home loans). The interest rate to be applied to such participant loans is equal to the revised interest rate used to determine the investment earnings on the assets of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability System.

Under the Federal Thrift Plan a participant has a 100% vested interest (i.e. a "non-forfeitable right" as that term is defined under ERISA section 3(19)) in the amount in each of the TRAs maintained for such person regardless of whether the source of the amount is from employee contributions, employer contributions, investment earnings, or rollover transfers from other plans.

In accordance with regulations of the FTP Board, the "investment or financial institutions" that may participate in the Federal Thrift Plan by offering "qualified investment programs" include (but are not limited to) banks, trust companies, savings and loan associations, credit unions, registered investment companies (mutual funds), securities broker-dealers, insurance companies, and real estate trusts.

The qualified investment programs offered by such institutions may include any investment generally permissible under a private tax-qualified pension plan (or more familiar to some would be the investments offered by such institutions with respect to individual retirement accounts—IRAs). By way of illustration such investments may include, but are not limited to stocks, corporate bonds, Treasury issues, certificates of deposit, time deposits, mutual funds, mortgage funds, real estate funds, annuities, etc.

Section 8366—Enforcement

In order to enforce the fiduciary and other standards applicable to investment programs, the Board of the Federal Thrift

Plan may exercise the investigative and civil enforcement authority similar to that provided the Secretary of Labor under ERISA.

The Board may utilize the facilities and services of any Federal agency to carry out its functions.

Section 8367—Audits

The ERISA-like audit and annual report requirements under Chapter 95 of Title 31, U.S.C. (as originally enacted under PL. 95-595, the Federal Pension Plan Reporting and Disclosure Act) are applicable to the Federal Thrift Plan.

Section 8368—FTP Board

The Federal Thrift Plan Board is composed of the Director of the Office of Personnel Management (or the Director's delegate) who serves as Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate), and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (or a delegate).

Under section 8369, the Board is authorized to prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of the Federal Thrift Plan.

Section 8370—Tax qualification

Comparable to the situation for private plans, the Federal Thrift Plan is considered to be a tax qualified plan which meets the requirements of section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code and is considered to be a tax qualified trust which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

While employee contributions are made to the Federal Thrift Plan on an after tax basis (and are not again taxed when distributed), the remainder of a participant's interest in a TRA is taxable at the time of distribution in the same manner as a distribution from a private tax qualified plan (i.e. as ordinary income unless distributed as a lump-sum in which case a special 10-year income averaging method applies; special tax rules also apply in the case of annuities). Taxes on all investment income earned under a participant's TRA are, therefore, deferred until the time they are actually distributed.

Section 8371—Appropriation

This section provides that appropriations be made to each employing agency to meet the employer matching contributions.

Effective Date—Federal thrift plan

The provisions of Title I establishing the Federal Thrift Plan are effective on the date of enactment, and employee and employer matching contributions to Thrift Retirement Accounts (TRAs) would be allowed beginning January 1, 1984.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

PART A—COVERAGE

Section 201—Definition of post-83 employee

Employees (including elected and appointed officials) currently covered under the Civil Service Retirement and Disability System (including those hired before mandatory Social Security coverage begins on January 1, 1984) continue to accrue pension benefits under their old CSRS formula (e.g. for general employees 1.5% per years of service for the first 5 years, 1.75% for the next five year, and 2% thereafter; special categories have varying accrual rates).

Except for the special categories, employees subject to CSRS hired in 1984 or later and who are covered under Social Security by reason of the 1983 Social Security Amendments are defined to be "post-83 employees" and for years of service after 1983, would accrue CSRS pension benefits (in ad-

dition to Social Security) at the rate of 1.15% for each such year of service.

Unless they make an irrevocable election to be treated under the new provisions for "post-83 employees", persons employed in the special category positions (whether first employed before or after 1983) would (1) continue to contribute to CSRS under present rules (i.e. their contributions would not be reduced to the 1.3% level as for post-83 employees) and (2) accrue CSRS pension benefits under the currently applicable formula. The special categories include law enforcement officers, firefighters, air traffic controllers, congressional employees, judges, all elected officials and those categories of employees hired before 1984 who are to be covered under Social Security as of January 1, 1984 (e.g. certain Executive Schedule and noncareer appointees in the Senior Executive Service).

Any current employee who is not automatically a "post-83" employee may make an irrevocable election to be treated as a post-83 employee. The election of such post-83 status would not affect any employee's past contributions or benefit accruals, but would change the level of future contributions (1.3%) and future CSRS benefit accruals (1.15%) with respect to any years of post-83 service performed after the election is made. Any employee making such an election would also be automatically covered under Social Security as of the time of the election (this is accomplished as a result of an amendment to the Social Security Act contained in Section 303). Positive results with respect to both employee benefits and the financing of the Social Security and Civil Service systems occur as the number of current employees electing post-83 status increases. Accordingly, a number of incentives (described earlier) are contained in the FAIR legislation in order to encourage current employees to elect post-83 status.

Section 202—Exclusion of new postal workers under CSRS

Officers and employees of the United States Postal Service hired after 1983 and who are covered under Social Security are excluded from the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability System (but are included in the Federal Thrift Plan, unless covered under a new defined contribution plan established by the Postal Service). The Postal Reorganization Act gives the Postal Service full power and authority to establishing a pension program through collective-bargaining for such new employees (as well as other employees). In the future all pension and disability costs would be borne fully by the Postal Service, without indirect government subsidy, as is consistent with the independent corporate status under which the Postal Service is expected to operate. On the request of the Postal Service the Office of Personnel Management could provide for the transfer to the new postal pension plan of some or all of the benefits and related plan assets for current postal employees.

Section 203—CSRS exclusion of new employees of the District of Columbia

General employees of the District of Columbia hired after 1983 and who are covered under Social Security are excluded from coverage under the Civil Service Retirement and Disability System. This is consistent with the charter given the District of Columbia under Home Rule and will allow the District to establish a plan for general employees just as it has for police, firefighters, teachers, and judges.

PART B—CONTRIBUTIONS TO AND FUNDING OF CSRS

Section 211—Contributions

The employee contribution rate under the CSRS for "post 83 employees" would be reduced to 1.3% of basic pay with respect to service after 1983. By definition "post-83 employees" are covered under Social Security and for such persons earning up to the Social Security maximum taxable wage base the combined 1983 OASDI contribution rate of 5.7% plus the CSRS contribution rate of 1.3% equals the 7% CSRS contribution rate applicable to current employees under present law. Thus, parity is achieved with respect to the initial contribution rates for current and post-83 employees.

As provided under the 1983 Social Security Amendments, the 1984 OASDI contribution of 5.7% applicable to post-83 employees is scheduled to rise in the future—to 6.06% in 1988 and to 6.2% in 1990. Therefore, in order to maintain parity between current and post-83 employees with respect to their future contribution rates, the bill provides for the 7% contribution rate applicable to current employees to be adjusted in the future by the same percentage increase applicable to post-83 employees under OASDI. Post-83 and current employee contribution rates would, as a result, total 7.36% in 1988-89 and 7.5% in 1990 and later years.

Agency contributions would, as under current law, continue to match the level of current employee contributions, but only until regulations are in place which would require full actuarial "normal costs" to be contributed (see section 212).

Section 212—Full actuarial funding required

Under FAIR the financing and solvency of the Civil Service Retirement System and Disability Fund is enhanced (1) by maintaining the one existing Fund to provide benefits for both current and post-83 employees, (2) by requiring that employer contributions (together with employee contributions) be sufficient to meet plan "normal costs" using "dynamic actuarial" assumptions, (3) by requiring 40 year amortization of initial unfunded liabilities, and (4) by providing the opportunity for enhanced investment earning (see section 221). As a result of requiring ERISA-like actuarial funding, agency budgets will on an ongoing basis reflect realistic costs of retirement and disability benefits and any chance that the Civil Service Fund would become technically insolvent would be eliminated.

During the Social Security debate some employee groups expressed their fears that a "new" system for employees covered under Social Security would lead to the "freezing" of the present CSRS and the operation of a wasting trust, thus putting present employee benefits in jeopardy. The continuance of the present CSR Trust Fund under FAIR and the full actuarial funding of benefits for both current and post-83 employees should eliminate such fears since they would have no basis in fact.

As soon as practicable after enactment, OPM is to issue regulations requiring each employing agency to contribute to the CSRS (1) for each post-83 employee, a percentage of basic pay based on the dynamic normal cost of benefits for post-83 employees less the employee contribution rate of 1.3%, and (2) for each employee, the percentage applicable to post-83 employees as in (1) plus the rate of employer contributions to OASDI (5.7% in 1984). The above contribution rates will achieve parity with

respect to employer contributions for both current and post-83 employees when both Social Security and CSRS contributions are considered.

In addition to the agency and employee contributions made equal to the plan's normal cost, a Federal Government contribution is to be made to the CSR Fund each fiscal year after regulations are in place in the amount required to amortize, in 40 annual installments as a level percentage of payroll, the unfunded liability of the CSRS computed as of the first such year.

Federal Government contributions are also to be made with respect to any subsequent net increase in unfunded liability arising from plan amendments, experience gains or losses, or changes in actuarial assumptions. Such contributions are determined annually on a "rolling" basis and are computed so as to be equivalent to the amount of the first installment, as if the cumulative net increase in unfunded liability were to be amortized in level installment over 15 years.

All actuarial determinations of normal cost and unfunded liability are to be made using "dynamic" actuarial assumptions which take into account future expected salary level (including general pay adjustments reflecting inflation) and post-retirement cost-of-living adjustments. This requirement differs from the present law funding basis under which "static" actuarial assumptions ignoring inflation and COLAs are used, thus resulting in the understatement of true actuarial cost levels. The "dynamic" basis is currently prescribed in connection with the actuarial valuation and disclosure of unfunded liabilities required under Public Law 95-595.

PART C—INVESTMENT OF CSR FUNDS

Section 221—Investment board

Consonant with private pension fund practice, the bill establishes a Fund Investment Board for CSRS consisting of the Director of the Office of Personnel Management (or the Director's delegate), the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate), and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (or the Director's delegate). It is the function of the Board to determine, in active consultation with the Advisory Panel on Fund Investments, the interest rate at which investments of the Fund are to be made. The membership of the Board is the same as that for the Federal Thrift Plan Board.

The Board is expected to obtain a rate of return on investments in line with private pension investment practices, as if the assets of the CSR Fund were actively managed. The rate of interest on the Treasury obligations in the Fund could not be less than the rate set under present law.

Section 222—Investment advisory panel

An Advisory Panel on Fund Investments is established to advise and assist the Fund Investment Board of the CSRS and the Federal Thrift Plan Board. The seven-member panel is drawn from among individuals generally recognized for their expertise in finance and investment generally and in private or governmental pension funds in particular.

Section 223—Tax qualification and protection of accrued benefits

Comparable to the situation for private plans, the Civil Service Retirement and Disability System is considered to be a tax qualified plan which meets the requirements of section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code and is considered to be a tax

qualified trust which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such code.

Just as for private plans, the tax qualified CSR plan is prohibited from reducing the accrued pension benefits of any participant. This is accomplished by subjecting the CSR System to the provisions of section 411(d)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

PART D—CHANGES TO CSRS RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Unless otherwise indicated the provisions under present law relating to CSRS retirement benefits remain unchanged—for example, the immediate eligibility and five-year vesting rules continue to apply with respect to current employees as well as post-83 employees.

Section 231—Indexation of deferred vested benefits

The FAIR bill makes a number of changes with respect to the benefits for employees terminated before retirement in order to overcome the criticism often directed at the present provisions of the Civil Service Retirement System which tend to create benefit disparities favoring high-paid long-service employees while providing few, if any, benefits for shorter-service employees, lower paid employees, and employees experiencing greater job mobility because of occupational or family necessity (e.g. engineers and women). Generally, the following provisions (applicable to the CSRS benefit structure for both current and post-83 employees) instill a greater measure of pension equity and portability to the benefits of such persons: 1) Sec. 231 provides for partial indexing of the deferred benefits of terminated employees, 2) Sec. 236 provides for interest to be paid on accumulated employee contributions, 3) Sec. 235 provides for the tax-free rollover into the Federal Thrift Plan of accumulated contributions that may be withdrawn by a terminated employee, 4) Sec. 237 provides that vested benefits attributable to employer contributions are not forfeited when employee contributions are rolled over, 5) terminated employees may elect a survivor annuity at the time of termination, and 6) the availability of Social Security and the fully vested amounts in the Federal Thrift Plan provide additional elements of benefit equity and portability.

Specifically section 231 provides that the deferred annuity of an employee separating from service will be increased for each year elapsed between the year of separation and the annuity commencement date by the lesser of 1) one-half the increase in the CPI or the increase in average Social Security covered wages, whichever is lower, or 2) 2 percent. This provision does not apply in the event employee contributions are withdrawn (i.e. rolled over into an IRA).

Section 232—Reduction for early retirement

As stated in the May 14, 1983 Washington Post editorial, "Those Federal Pensions," Federal pensions are currently much better than even the most generous private worker plans together with Social Security (e.g. workers can retire at age 55 with 30 years of service on full unreduced pensions).

The FAIR bill takes a comprehensive approach to bringing about a more rational CSRS retirement structure both with respect to deferred retirement benefits (described in section 231) as well as early retirement benefits. The criticism of the Civil Service Retirement System will continue unless the present early retirement provisions are made more defensible and comparable to mainstream practices.

Therefore, section 232 provides that future retirement benefit accruals be reduced by 2% for each year actual age at retirement precedes age 65.

Current employees as well as post-83 employees would be able to retire under the same age-service provisions as under present law, but the amount of benefits based on service after 1983 would be subject to the 2% reduction factor. The 2% rule would not reduce the amount of any employee's benefit which is accrued prior to 1984.

The application of the 2% early retirement factor can be illustrated as follows: (1) for a current employee retiring at age 55 with 30 years of service as of January 1, 1985 the 2% factor would only apply to the pension accrual in 1984, thus producing a benefit of 55.85% of high-3 pay (i.e. 1½% for first 5 years, 1¼% for 2nd five years, 2% for 19 years, and the 30th year accrual of 2% times the early retirement factor of 80% at age 55—100% less 2% times 65 less 55); this compares with the 56.25% benefit under present law; (2) for a current employee retiring in 1994 at age 55 with 30 years of service the 80% early retirement factor would apply to the 10 years of post-83 service, thus producing a benefit of 52.25% of high-3 pay compared with 56.25% under present law; (3) employees hired in 1983 as well as post-83 employees' retiring in the year 2014 or later at age 55 with 30 years of service would have their benefit computed as 56% times the 80% early retirement factor at age 55 or 44.8% (of course substantial employee and employer purchased benefits under Federal Thrift Plan accumulations would be available to such persons to supplement the defined-benefit CSRS pension); (4) the typical federal employee retiring at between age 61 and 62 would have post-83 accruals reduced by 6 to 8%; the benefit of such a person with 30 years of service would be 56.09% (versus the present 56.25% of high-3 pay) if retiring in 1985 and 54.65% if retiring in 1994; (5) the benefits of current and post-83 employees retiring at age 65 or later would be 100% of their accrued benefits, since the early retirement reduction factor would not apply.

It might be noted that the 2% early retirement adjustment factor is the same as the factor that currently applies to retirements under age 55. While the new 2% reduction under age 65 for early retirement is not equivalent to an "actuarial reduction," its application in combination with the post-83 benefit accrual formula (discussed in the next section) is designed to produce early retirement benefit levels comparable to the levels found in the better private sector pension plans. The effect of the early retirement reduction is also mitigated for post-83 employees choosing the so-called Social Security leveling option (see section 240) and also for those having Federal Thrift Plan accumulations which can be converted to early retirement annuities.

Section 233—Retirement accrual to be 1.15% for post-83 employee

Under the bill, post-83 employees as well as current employees electing post-83 status accrue CSRS retirement benefits at the rate of 1.15% for each year of service after 1983. The accumulated accrual percentage is applied to high-3 basic pay as is the case under present law. The retirement benefit so computed is then subject to the 2% early retirement adjustment discussed under Section 232. The accrual rates under present law continue to apply to current employees and employees in special occupational categories who do not elect post-83 status.

The following objectives were used to develop the accrual rate, the early retirement factor and other new retirement features of the CSRS as applicable to post-83 employees (who also accrue retirement benefits under Social Security):

(1) Combined retirement benefits from the revised CSRS System and Social Security should, when coordinated, provide initial post-retirement income levels close to pre-retirement after tax income levels for "full-career" (30-40) years, moderate-income, employees who retire at age 65 or later. Such benefits should not be less than the benefits provided current employees retiring under similar circumstances.

(2) Post-retirement adjustments should be provided to CSRS pensions in order that initial levels of retirement income provided from Social Security and the CSRS System not be significantly diminished because of future increases in the cost-of-living. The adjustments should be affordable, and they should be capped for those with above average income in order to maintain the fiscal integrity of the retirement system (see explanation under section 401).

(3) The revised CSRS retirement benefit structure should provide benefits comparable to those found under good retirement programs operated by major employers in the private and state and local government sector.

(4) There should be no reductions in benefits already accrued and no unreasonable reductions in expected benefits for current employees (see section 223 for benefit accrual protection).

(5) The revised CSRS benefit structure should be more equitable than the current one with respect to long-service versus short-service employees, especially as it applies to employees with split-service and occupations requiring job mobility (also see section 231).

(6) The provisions of the revised CSRS should meet ERISA standards and not be inconsistent with Internal Revenue Service regulations concerning the "integration" (coordination) of pension benefits with Social Security.

(7) The modified CSRS should be as simple to administer as possible and not be disruptive to the present system of delivering benefits.

(8) The long-term costs to the Federal Government of the modified CSRS and the new Federal Thrift Plan plus the Government's contribution to Social Security should approximate the Government's cost (i.e. as measured by the dynamic actuarial normal cost) of the CSRS with respect to the retirement benefits for current employees (taking into account revisions with respect to COLAs, early retirement, disability, and deferred vested benefits).

The following replacement rates (after tax post-retirement CSRS and Social Security benefits as a percentage of pre-retirement after-tax income) based on the post-83 1.15% per year of service formula show that the standard-of-living target objectives in (1) above are met with respect to moderate-income full-career employees.

REPLACEMENT RATES AT AGE 65 FOR A SINGLE EMPLOYEE WITH 30 YEARS OF SERVICE

Final pay	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000
Revised system with no thrift plan participation (percent)	93.1	84.5	77.2
Revised system with thrift plan participation (percent)	121.5	111.1	105.1
Current CSRS (percent)	64.7	64.9	61.5

Replacement rates at all income levels under the revised CSRS formula exceed those under the current system for those retiring at age 65 as well as those retiring at 62 when Social Security first become available (see Tables in Appendix which also contains the assumptions used by the Congressional Research Service in developing the rates).

While the current CSRS formula is "back-loaded" (providing lower accruals for short-service employees), consistent with the objectives in (5) above the revised formula provides a constant 1.15 percent for each year of service. The simpler formula coupled with the continuation of other benefit computational rules as under present law (e.g. high-3 pay, aggregation and service repurchase rules, etc) meets the objectives in (7) for a simple non-disruptive revision.

The constant formula of 1.15 percent, taking into account Social Security benefits, was found to achieve the target replacement rates without having to resort to a more complex "integrated" formula. A 100 percent Social Security offset formula for determining retirement benefits (as advanced in other proposals) was considered but rejected since the approach would be contrary to current Internal Revenue Service regulations on plan integration (see goal (6) above), would be administratively complex (see goal (7) above), and would require a complicated and potentially inequitable attribution of Social Security benefits, especially with respect to shorter service employees (see goal (5) above). The 100 percent offset approach however, is utilized with respect to coordinating post-83 disability and survivor benefits with Social Security, since the offset approach with respect to such benefits does not violate the IRS integration rules, does not require inequitable attribution rules, and is the only approach guaranteeing the maintenance of current disability and survivor benefit levels (see Part F).

An integrated formula is usually utilized in order to maintain a relatively constant "target" replacement rate at all income levels, since Social Security alone provides higher replacement rates for the lower paid. However, the annuity benefits available from savings accumulations under the Federal Thrift Plan bring the total benefits for employees having above average federal earnings up to the target replacement rates for the lower paid (considering Social Security and CSRS benefits alone), thus allowing the simpler 1.15% formula to be used instead of a more complicated integrated one. For example, the replacement rates for the \$40,000, \$50,000 and \$60,000 case comparable to those shown above at lower income levels amount to 100.7%, 92.7%, and 87.6%, respectively.

The 1.15% formula accompanied by the Federal Thrift Plan is an approach similar to one advanced by the Universal Social Security Coverage Study Group (chaired by Joseph W. Barlett) in its March 1980 report.

Section 234—No post-83 minimum annuity

The minimum retirement annuity under present law is necessitated since employees are not covered under Social Security. Since Post-83 employees are covered under Social Security, a minimum is no longer necessary; thus the minimum is eliminated as being redundant.

Section 235—Rollover of contributions of separated employees into TRA's

Under present law an employee, upon early separation, may withdraw his or her contributions (without interest) resulting in

the forfeiture of the employer purchased part of any deferred annuity. Section 235 provides that future withdrawals by either current or post-83 employees will automatically be rolled-over, tax free, into a TRA of the employee's own choosing. In addition, under section 237 the CSRS is conformed to ERISA so that the employer purchased part of the deferred vested benefit is not forfeited if employee contributions are withdrawn.

Section 236—Interest credited to employee contributions

After 1983 the accumulated value of both a post-83 and a current employee's contributions is to be credited with interest (at the overall earnings rate applicable to the Civil Service Trust Fund). As described in section 235, the accumulated value of employee contributions including interest may be rolled-over by a separated employee into a TRA.

Section 237—Deferred annuity not fully forfeited if employee withdraws contributions

See section 235 for a description of this provision as it applies to both current and post-83 employees.

Section 238—Conform COLA to social security COLA

Effective January 1, 1984 the cost-of-living adjustment under the CSRS is conformed in timing and amount to the COLA adjustment under Social Security. This is a technical amendment included as part of the initiative under FAIR to place all federal retirement and disability programs on the same COLA basis in order to ease the administration of the COLA limitation under section 401.

Section 239—COLA limitation

This is a cross-reference to section 401.

Section 240—Social security leveling option

A new retirement annuity option, termed a Social Security leveling option, is extended to post-83 employees retiring early in order that they may have a more level lifetime income rather than an income which jumps significantly when Social Security benefits become available. By means of the use of this option the effect of the early retirement reduction factor will be mitigated to some extent.

To illustrate the application of this option—a post-83 employee retiring at age 55 with 30 years service would be entitled to a CSRS pension of 34.5% of high-3 pay subject to the early retirement factor of 80% (2% per year reduction under age 65) equal to \$5,198 (in the case in which final pay is \$20,000 expressed in current dollars); 10 years later at 65 the employee may elect to begin receiving Social Security benefits, thus nearly doubling the employees' retirement income level at such time; in the alternative the employee may elect the Social Security leveling option thus raising the person's initial level of retirement income at age 55 from \$5,198 to, say, about \$9,000; at 65 when Social Security is elected and CSRS benefits are actuarially reduced under the leveling option, the person's total benefits would continue at the pre-65 level (subject to any applicable indexation).

An employee may elect that the increased CSRS benefit be paid under the leveling option up to any age selected between age 62 and 67 (when Social Security becomes available) at which time CSRS benefits are actuarially reduced to maintain a level income.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS
PART E—SURVIVOR BENEFITS
Section 241—Separated employees eligible for survivor annuity

Under the provisions of this section both current and post-83 employees who separate with vested benefits before reaching retirement age may elect to have a 50% survivor annuity paid to a spouse. The value of the survivor annuity and the reduced deferred annuity is to be equivalent to the value of the unreduced deferred annuity. This option is an alternative to the provision in present law under which a survivor is paid the lump-sum value of the employee's contributions in the event of the death of the separated employee before age 62.

Section 242—Offset of social security survivor benefits

Under FAIR the combined survivor benefits from Social Security and the CSRS are the same as under present law. In order to accomplish this, the CSRS benefits for survivors of post-83 employees are reduced by the amount of survivor benefits to which such persons are entitled under Social Security.

PART F—DISABILITY BENEFITS

Section 251—Disability eligibility

The conditions under which CSRS disability benefits are available for both current and post-83 employees is changed to include that such benefits would not be available as long as the employee is able to render useful and efficient service in a vacant civilian position in a Federal agency within a reasonable commuting distance from the last place of employment. The employee's pay could not be reduced even though the pay in the new position is rated as low as 80% of the pay level of the former position. This provision is consistent with recommendations to the Congress made by the General Accounting Office.

Section 252—Post-83 disability annuities

Generally, the amount of the disability annuity under CSRS to which a current employee may become entitled in the future is unchanged from that under current law.

The amount of the disability annuity to which a post-83 employee may become entitled under CSRS (including Social Security disability, if applicable) is in most cases improved over the disability levels under current law. This is to bring the level of CSRS disability more in line with private sector practices. The CSRS disability amount for payment years prior to the Social Security normal retirement age, presently age 65, is equal to the larger of (A) or (B) reduced by the amount of any disability benefits (including family benefits) the person actually receives under Social Security (see section 254 for Social Security disability offset), where (A) is the actual amount of the employee's accrued early retirement benefit taking into account the early retirement reduction factor (see section 232) and assuming the Social Security leveling option is elected (whether actually elected or not pursuant to section 240), and where (B) is the lesser of (1) 40% of the post-83 employee's high-3 pay, or 50% in the case in which the employee is receiving Social Security disability, or (2) the alternative formula under present law but increased by 10% in the event the employee is receiving Social Security disability.

Upon attaining the normal retirement age under Social Security (presently age 65) the disability benefits of a disabled employee are converted to normal retirement benefits and the individual would in addition be eli-

gible to receive the full amount of Social Security benefits to which the person is entitled.

For situations described in (A) above, the amount of retirement benefits after normal retirement age would continue to be based on the computed amount of the person's benefits received before such age subject to any cost-of-living increases (i.e. the actual amount of the employee's accrued retirement benefit subject to any Social Security leveling option that may have been elected at the time of disability).

For situations described in (B) above, at normal retirement the disability amount is recomputed to be the greater of (1) the amount of the employee's accrued early retirement benefit computed at the time of disability, increased by the amount of any applicable cost-of-living adjustments between the time of disability and the attainment of the Social Security normal retirement age, or (2) the excess of (i) the amount computed under (B) above at the time of disability increased by the amount of any applicable cost-of-living adjustments between the time of disability and the attainment of the Social Security normal retirement age over (ii) a fixed amount of Social Security "offset" computed as the annual Social Security retirement benefit using only the service and basic pay of the employee under Civil Service employment.

Section 253—Employee must apply for social security disability

In order to maintain the integrity of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability System all employees applying for disability benefits under the CSRS must also apply for disability benefits under Social Security, unless exempted from such requirement under regulations prescribed by OPM.

Section 254—Social security disability offset

See explanation of this provision under section 252.

Section 255—Limitation of disability annuity based on excess earnings

In order to encourage the rehabilitation of disabled employees and their return to full time employment, the bill provides for the reduction in the amount of a disabled employee's annuity to keep the combined amount of the disability annuity and the amount of income earned by the disabled employee in other employment at a level not in excess of the final pay of the employee prior to disablement (adjusted for subsequent general pay increases).

This provision does not apply to a person receiving Social Security disability benefits or to a person enrolled in a rehabilitation program as described in section 256.

Section 256—Disability rehabilitation pilot program

Within 180 days after enactment the OPM is to establish a pilot program under which disabled employees (other than those receiving Social Security disability) would be provided vocational rehabilitation and job placement counseling evaluation for purposes of determining the person's suitability for returning to the same occupation or another occupation for which the person is qualified by reason of training or experience.

The OPM may contract with the Secretary of Labor or with any insurance or other experienced vocational rehabilitation organization to provide such a pilot program. Within 5 years OPM would report to the Congress on the effectiveness of such a program together with any recommendations

for legislation to establish a permanent program.

Section 257—Long-term disability coverage for new employees

As under present law, current as well as post-83, employees would not be eligible for CSRS disability benefits until they meet the 5-year service requirement. Under this section employees may purchase long-term disability coverage for the first 5 years of employment, from insurance carriers at group insurance rates, under a Federally sponsored program managed by OPM.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO ERISA, FECA, THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Section 301—Conform FECA COLA to social security COLA

Beginning January 1, 1985 the cost-of-living adjustment applicable to benefits under the Federal Employee Compensation Act is conformed in timing and amount to the annual COLA adjustment under Social Security. As a matter of transition, no COLA adjustment would be made in 1984 but the January 1985 adjustment would provide a "catch-up" for the change in the CPI from December 1982 applicable to the last adjustment in 1983.

This is a technical amendment included as part of the initiative under FAIR to place all federal retirement and disability programs on the same COLA basis in order to ease the administration of the 60% COLA limitation as provided for under the second bill in the FAIR legislative package.

Section 302—ERISA coverage for new Postal Service pension plans

As stated under section 202, Postal Service employees newly covered under Social Security are excluded from coverage under the Civil Service Retirement and Disability System. Any new pension plan or plans established by the Postal Service for new or other employees would, under this section, be subject to the provisions of the Employee Retirement Income and Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) and the related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 303—Social security amendments

This section provides for Social Security coverage for current civil service employees who elect coverage under both Social Security and the revised provisions of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability System applicable to new employees. The so-called "windfall" reduction under Social Security would be made inapplicable to employees electing such coverage in cases in which such employees have 10 or more years of post-83 service.

TITLE IV—COLA'S AND ADMINISTRATION

Section 401—60 percent COLA limitation

The "60% COLA limitation" provided in this section is the specific application to the CSRS of the COLA limitation applicable to all federal retirement programs as contained in the first bill of the FAIR legislative package.

In this instance the COLA increase applicable to CSRS annuities (other than survivor benefits) is limited to 60% of the COLA increase with respect to that portion of an employee's pension which, together with any primary retirement benefits to which the employee is entitled under Social Security or the Military Retirement System, exceeds \$10,000. The \$10,000 amount applicable in 1984 is increased annually to the same extent that benefits are increased in accordance with the cost-of-living provisions of the Social Security Act.

The 60% COLA limitation applies to the benefits of current as well as post-83 employees. The exclusion of the first \$10,000 of retirement income from the 60% COLA limitation will continue to allow 100% COLA increases for that portion of CSRS pensions under \$10,000—thus the CSRS pensions of employees who in the past were not covered under Social Security could be viewed as being composed of two parts, the first part up to \$10,000 might be termed the "Social Security part" for which the COLA is 100% and the remainder above \$10,000 (if any) might be termed the "supplemental pension part" for which the COLA is 60% of the applicable increase.

The application of the 60% limitation can be illustrated as follows: given a retired employee having \$4,000 in Social Security benefits, \$5,000 in retirement benefits based on military service, and \$6,000 in CSRS benefits, the COLA with respect to the Social Security benefits, the military retirement benefits and the first \$1,000 of CSRS benefits would be 100% of the applicable cost-of-living formula while the COLA applicable to the \$5,000 remainder of CSRS benefits over \$10,000 (i.e. \$4,000 + \$5,000 + \$6,000 - \$10,000 = \$5,000) would be limited to 60% of the cost-of-living increase. Assuming a 5% increase in the cost-of-living formula with respect to a particular year, the COLA increase under current law would be 5% of \$15,000 or \$750 while the new formula would produce a COLA increase of \$650 (i.e. 5% [\$4,000 + \$5,000 + \$1,000] + 5% × 60 × [\$5,000 - \$10,000]). Therefore the average Federal retiree having \$15,000 in combined Federal retirement benefits in 1984 would have an effective COLA increase equal to 86.7% of the current level.

The adoption of the 60% COLA limitation is intended to instill an increased measure of defensibility, comparability, and affordability to the system of benefits provided under the CSRS. The effective range of the revised CSRS COLA—from 100% for benefits under \$10,000 to 66% for benefits at the \$60,000 level—still leaves the CSRS among the most generous of the nation's public and private pension plans in providing post-retirement COLAs. A recent study for the Department of Labor shows that for private pension retirees fortunate enough to actually have automatic and/or ad hoc post-retirement increases, the average increase amounted to only about 1/3 of the increase in the CPI for the period 1973 through 1979.

Section 402—Transfer of administration to OPM

This section brings within the Federal government (OPM) the administration of Federal retirement benefits now administered by the District of Columbia (e.g. in relation to benefits for the Secret Service, the Park Police and others).

SUMMARY OF TITLE I-IV

The second bill, the Federal Annuity and Investment Reform Act, is designed to meet the many objectives enumerated earlier and summarized below.

(1) The revised system will provide initial retirement benefit levels equal to or close to pre-retirement living standards for full-career "post-83" employees at moderate income levels (considering Social Security and CSRS defined benefits only); a similar retirement income target for higher-paid employees is achieved when the annuity income from Federal Thrift Plan accumulations is considered.

(2) The initial retirement income levels for full-career post-83 employees retiring at

62 or later (when Social Security becomes available) are enhanced over current levels and are then fully kept up with the cost-of-living for retirement income levels under \$10,000 (indexed after 1984 to rise the same as Social Security benefits) and partially indexed at 60% of the CPI for retirement income levels above the \$10,000 limit; the availability of Federal Thrift Plan accumulations would allow for additional COLA supplementation.

(3) The revised 1.15% CSRS formula and the new Federal Thrift Plan are designed to be coordinated with Social Security in order to bring about greater benefit comparability with the pension arrangements offered by major private sector employers; additional benefit comparability is accomplished through the introduction of the 2% early retirement adjustment factor applicable to post-83 service and the 60% COLA limitation above \$10,000.

(4) The revised system is much more equitable in the manner in which it treats shorter service and mobile employees as a result of the portability offered by the fully and immediately vested benefits under both the Federal Thrift Plan and Social Security, the introduction of a constant accrual rate which is not "backloaded" as under present law, the payment of interest on employee contributions, the partial indexing of deferred annuities, the tax-free rollover of distribution into TRAs, the nonforfeiture of vested employer-paid benefits, and the availability of a survivor option for terminated employees.

(5) The revised system meets ERISA benefit and funding standards, prohibits reductions in accrued benefits, and extends the tax benefits attendant with tax-qualified plan status to employee distributions from the CSRS and the Federal Thrift Plan.

(6) The revised system provides for parity in the employee contribution percentage rate for current and post-83 employees and for parity with respect to benefits and future employer costs with respect to such employees; the 60% COLA limitation, the 2% early retirement adjustment applicable to post-83 service, the portability features in (4) above, and the provision for voluntary employee contributions to the Federal Thrift Plan apply in the same manner to current employees as well as post-83 employees.

(7) The health of the OASDI trust funds are enhanced by several billion dollars per year as a result of the employee and Federal employer contributions to Social Security on behalf of current employees who elect post-83 status (a large percentage is expected to elect such status due to a number of benefit incentives offered); the added balance to the OASDI trust funds will better enable such funds to restore the past amounts borrowed from the Medicare trust funds, and may also permit additional inter-fund borrowing to take place from OASDI to Medicare which current projections show may become necessary later in the decade.

H.R. 5753—COLA stabilizer

Over the past few years there has been an expanding debate over the impact that the uncontrolled automatic indexing of federal programs has had on the federal budget, interest rates, the economy, and the income distributions of the working and non-working population. Nearly 90 federal entitlement and non-entitlement programs have their benefits automatically adjusted to increase with inflation, generally as measured by the Consumer Price Index. According to

the Congressional Budget Office nearly one-third of total federal spending is accounted for under indexed entitlement programs. Over the past four years alone the COLAs under these programs have increased program spending by 50%. Retirement and disability programs account for over 99% of all COLA-related entitlement program spending.

In order to help assure long-term program solvency and to regain a measure of fiscal control, my legislation contains a COLA stabilizer which would limit automatic increases after 1983 to the lesser of the increase in national wages (the index used in adjusting the maximum taxable wage under Social Security) or the increase in the Consumer Price Index (or other automatic COLA mechanism that may be applicable under a particular program). The stabilizer would apply to all pension, annuity, retirement, disability, or similar programs operated by the federal government including but not limited to the Civil Service Retirement System, the Uniformed Services Retirement System, the Railroad Retirement System, and the Social Security system (retirement programs basing benefits on need would be exempted).

The legislative mechanism whereby the COLA stabilizer would be implemented requires: (1) that the President submit budgets for Fiscal Year 1985 and later which conform to the requirements of the COLA stabilizer; and (2) that the Congress expedite the required implementing legislation submitted by the President in accordance with a special highly privileged House and Senate rule. As a technical matter the Average Hourly Earnings Index published by the Department of Labor is used as the restraint in the COLA stabilizer for the first year of application. In subsequent years a corrective factor would be applied so that in the long run the wage index constraint would conform to the rise in national wages as defined in the Social Security Act for purposes of computing the increase in the maximum taxable wage base.

The refrain that I hear from federal employees concerning their Civil Service benefits and from other retirees concerning their Social Security benefits is that they are willing to accept some adjustments in their future COLAs, if that would help to better guarantee future program solvency, but that they do not want their benefits to be singled out unfairly. That is why under my FAIR legislation the COLA stabilizer would apply uniformly and across the board to civilian federal employees, military and other uniformed personnel, and Social Security recipients as well.

The proposal also introduces a greater measure of equity and fairness to entitlement COLAs when compared with COLAs working members of the population have received in connection with their wages. Analysts have pointed out that benefit recipients fare better than the workers whose taxes and contributions support each system, when wages do not keep pace with inflation. While basic benefits should be kept up with inflation on some basis, retired people should not receive greater cost-of-living protection than working people, yet that is what has happened. In recent years, the average cost-of-living wage increase agreed upon in private sector collective bargaining has been only 60 percent of the increase in the Consumer Price Index, and persons drawing retirement benefits have received fatter annual increases than wage earners in union agreements in 10 out of the past 12 years.

Besides restoring economic equity between the working and non-working generations, the proposed COLA changes will go a long way in helping stabilize the OASDI and other federal retirement system trust funds in the event we again experience irregular periods of economic activity in which prices rise more rapidly than wages. In fact a significant share of the Social Security actuarial imbalance and \$150-\$200 billion near-term shortfall which gave rise to the 1982 amendments can be directly traced to cost-of-living increases outpacing wage increases in just the past four years.

It should be noted that the actuarial and economic projections relied on by the Congress in shaping the Social Security rescue package do not anticipate a repeat of recent economic experience during which price increases exceeded wage increases. It is only prudent, therefore, that this Congress extend the COLA stabilizer concept so as to provide a meaningful financial safety mechanism for Social Security and all other federal retirement systems. As policymakers who will be held accountable, we should not abdicate our responsibilities by waiting until the next cycle of unfavorable economic conditions when uncontrolled overindexation again creates large unmanageable unfunded pension liabilities. Over \$100 billion or about one-fifth of the half-trillion dollar-plus unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement Fund arose during just the first several years of the 1980s.

The COLA stabilizer is the true embodiment of the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. A triggering of the stabilizer mechanism will not result in a cut in any persons' benefits but would merely limit future benefit increases. For example, if for a particular year the consumer price index were to rise by, say, 11% while wages were to rise by 10%, the 1% difference in benefit increase for a person drawing \$400 per month in benefits would amount to \$4 per month (i.e., benefits would go up by \$40 rather than \$44 as would otherwise be provided by a full CPI increase). When viewed at the level of the individual, most would welcome the \$40 increase and have little in the way of expectation as to whether the increase would be \$40 or \$44. However, at the macro level the 1% differential would translate in today's dollars into a \$2 billion easing of the strain on all federal old age, disability, and retirement systems.

The COLA stabilizer would be triggered only during times of abnormal economic activity and distress, and as the economy reverts to periods of growth the Congress could always consider ad hoc benefit increases which could provide for some or all of a "catch up" in the \$4 monthly difference resulting from the smaller rise in wages. The Congressional review process might also take into consideration the technical deficiencies in the CPI which have allowed benefit increases to overcompensate for inflation in the past.

The economic assumptions used in both the President's budget and the budgets the Congress is considering do not anticipate that wages will rise more slowly than prices as measured by the CPI. The COLA stabilizer would not, as a result, be projected to have an impact on expected future budget items or deficits (although in reality it might if projections prove faulty). Therefore, the COLA stabilizer provision can be discussed and adopted in an atmosphere absent from the shrill rhetoric that is currently associated with the budget process and the size of the federal deficit.

In summary, the FAIR legislation would extend the concept of a fail-safe COLA stabilizer across the board, not just to Social Security (in which the fail safe mechanism was only partially installed as part of the recent Social Security legislation) but to all other federal retirement programs as well. This nation can ill afford another round of unanticipated economic irregularities in which uncontrolled indexation unfairly redistributes income, creates large program deficits and added economic problems, and thereby leaves future Congresses and taxpayers with only much more difficult choices.

APPENDIX

[Provided by Congressional Research Service]

COMPARISON OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS WITH REVISED SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

This report is in response to your request of February 4, 1983, for earnings replacement rates for a series of different social security and pension plan alternatives. The option selected for comparison with the present Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) and the assumptions used were specified by Russell Mueller of your staff. The report provides no cost estimates.

DOCUMENTATION FOR EARNINGS REPLACEMENT ANALYSIS

The following fourteen tables show how much of a worker's earnings would be replaced by retirement income. Replacement rates—the ratio of retirement benefits to preretirement earnings—provide one measure of the adequacy of pension benefits. Because retirement also brings changes in consumption patterns, tax liabilities, work-related expenses and savings rates, most analysts agree that retirees can maintain their preretirement standard of living with pension benefits that replace less than 100 percent of their final year's gross earnings.

The following tables show the estimated retirement income that would be received by workers retiring in 1985: (a) under the present Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) and (b) under the revised retirement system selected for study. The revised system would include coverage under social security, mandatory participation in a supplemental defined benefit plan, and optional participation in a thrift (savings) plan. Under the defined benefit plan selected a worker would earn a benefit of 1.15 percent of final average salary for each year of participation. Final average salary is defined as that received in the highest 3 consecutive years. Benefits are reduced by 2 percent for each year under age 65 (e.g. a worker retiring at age 62 would receive 94 percent of the benefit payable at age 65). Workers would be required to make contributions not only to social security, but also to contribute 3 percent of salary to the defined benefit plan. In addition, employees could elect to contribute up to 3 percent of salary into a thrift plan. The thrift plan payment would be fully matched by an employer contribution.

The Congressional Research Service calculated both gross and net earnings replacement rates for six hypothetical workers. Gross replacement rates are arrived at by dividing total retirement income by the final year's earnings. Net replacement rates are arrived at by dividing (a) retirement income received after payment of taxes by (b) preretirement earnings after payment of

taxes and contributions for social security, the pension plan, or the thrift plan.

Many assumptions must be made to calculate net earnings replacement rates. The following assumptions were made.

Federal taxes

Several assumptions have been made in order to determine hypothetical Federal tax liabilities as given in this report. For those individuals in their final work year and first year of retirement, a zero bracket amount¹ or, if larger, deductible expenses equal to 23 percent of adjusted gross income was used to compute the appropriate Federal tax liability.

For those persons eligible for the Tax Credit for the Elderly, the appropriate amount was computed based upon the Social Security Amendments of 1983.

The following tax rate schedules were used to compute the Federal tax liability. The tax calculations do not take into account indexing of the tax rate schedules, the zero bracket amount, or the personal exemption amount, which will go into effect with respect to 1985 taxes.

Tax rate schedule for single individuals for taxable years beginning after 1983

If taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over \$2,300.....	No tax.
Over \$2,300 but not over \$3,400.....	11% of the excess over \$2,300.
Over \$3,400 but not over \$4,400.....	\$121, plus 12% of the excess over \$3,400.
Over \$4,400 but not over \$6,500.....	\$241, plus 14% of the excess over \$4,400.
Over \$6,500 but not over \$8,500.....	\$535, plus 15% of the excess over \$6,500.
Over \$8,500 but not over \$10,800.....	\$835, plus 16% of the excess over \$8,500.
Over \$10,800 but not over \$12,900.....	\$1,203, plus 18% of the excess over \$10,800.
Over \$12,900 but not over \$15,000.....	\$1,581, plus 20% of the excess over \$12,900.
Over \$15,000 but not over \$18,200.....	\$2,001, plus 23% of the excess over \$15,000.
Over \$18,200 but not over \$23,500.....	\$2,737, plus 26% of the excess over \$18,200.
Over \$23,500 but not over \$28,800.....	\$4,115, plus 30% of the excess over \$23,500.
Over \$28,800 but not over \$34,100.....	\$5,705, plus 34% of the excess over \$28,800.
Over \$34,100 but not over \$41,500.....	\$7,507, plus 38% of the excess over \$34,100.
Over \$41,500 but not over \$55,300.....	\$10,319, plus 42% of the excess over \$41,500.
Over \$55,300 but not over \$81,800.....	\$16,115, plus 48% of the excess over \$55,300.
Over \$81,800.....	\$28,835, plus 50% of the excess over \$81,800.

Tax rate schedule for married individuals filing joint return for taxable years beginning after 1983

If taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over \$3,400.....	No tax.
Over \$3,400 but not over \$5,500.....	11% of the excess over \$3,400.
Over \$5,500 but not over \$7,600.....	\$231, plus 12% of the excess over \$5,500.
Over \$7,600 but not over \$11,900.....	\$463, plus 14% of the excess over \$7,600.
Over \$11,900 but not over \$16,000.....	\$1,085, plus 16% of the excess over \$11,900.
Over \$16,000 but not over \$20,200.....	\$1,741, plus 18% of the excess over \$16,000.
Over \$20,200 but not over \$24,600.....	\$2,497, plus 22% of the excess over \$20,200.
Over \$24,600 but not over \$29,900.....	\$3,465, plus 25% of the excess over \$24,600.
Over \$29,900 but not over \$35,200.....	\$4,790, plus 28% of the excess over \$29,900.
Over \$35,200 but not over \$45,800.....	\$6,274, plus 33% of the excess over \$35,200.
Over \$45,800 but not over \$60,000.....	\$9,772, plus 38% of the excess over \$45,800.

¹ The zero-bracket amount is commonly referred to as the standard deduction.

If taxable income is:	The tax is:
Over \$60,000 but not over \$85,600.....	\$15,168, plus 42% of the excess over \$60,000.
Over \$85,600 but not over \$109,400.....	\$25,920, plus 45% of the excess over \$85,600.
Over \$109,400 but not over \$162,400.....	\$36,630, plus 49% of the excess over \$109,400.
Over \$162,400.....	\$62,600, plus 50% of the excess over \$162,400.

Source: General explanation of ERTA prepared by Joint Committee of Taxation, Dec. 31, 1981.

State and local government income tax assumptions

There is great disparity in the tax structure of State and local governments. For purposes of computing net earnings replacement rates, a general assumption was made that State-local personal income tax liability was 21.5 percent of the Federal income tax liability for single taxpayers, and 22.6 percent for married taxpayers. These rates were derived from an analysis of the relationship of State individual income taxes on specified wages and salaries during calendar year 1975 contrasted to Federal income taxes prepared in 1976 by Lillian Rymarowicz of the Economics Division in the Congressional Research Service. This analysis showed that average State taxes as a percentage of the Federal income tax was 21.5 percent for single taxpayers and 22.6 percent for married taxpayers. This analysis, however, did not include individual income taxes levied by local governments or tax credits for such payments against State income tax liability. Therefore, the ratio would be understated. However, States are beginning to index their individual income tax rates for inflation. This has the effect of lowering tax rates for higher income individuals.

Social security taxes

Social security taxes are based on the Social Security Amendments of 1983. In computing net final year's earnings in 1984, employees are assumed to contribute 5.7 percent of their salaries up to \$37,800 for the Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance (OASDI) component of social security. Social security benefits are included in taxable retirement income for higher income persons whose taxable income combined with 50 percent of their social security benefits exceed a base amount. The base amount is \$25,000 for an individual and \$32,000 for a married couple filing a joint return. The amount of benefits included in taxable income is the lesser of one-half of benefits or one-half of the excess of the taxpayer's combined income (i.e., adjusted gross income plus one-half of benefits) over the base amount.

Social security benefits

Benefits shown are for individuals retiring in 1985 at ages 62 and 65 who always had their wages increase in the same proportion as wages in the economy. The determination of benefits, although computed for 1985, assumes a fully mature system in which 35 years of earnings are used in the computation and all wages, including those at the maximum limit, are indexed to average wage growth in the economy. Also, benefits are computed under the provisions of the Social Security Amendments of 1983, which apply to benefit computations in the year 2022 and beyond, i.e., "full" retirement at age 67 with actuarial reductions for benefits taken at ages 62 and 65. Calculations are based on preliminary 1983 Trustees Report assumptions (February 18, 1983).

Defined benefit and thrift plan contributions

Employees contribute 3 percent of salaries as their share of the cost of the defined ben-

efit plan. When employees participate in the thrift (or savings) plan, they are assumed to contribute 3 percent of their salaries. This is fully matched by an employer contribution of 3 percent. The combined 6 percent contribution is assumed to be invested with interest compounded annually in a tax-deferred account.

Interest rate assumptions (1945-84)

Interest on the accumulated thrift plan contributions was compounded annually during the period 1953-1984 according to the interest rate for 10-year constant maturing U.S. Treasury securities. For years 1945-1952, the interest rate was the average rate for new-issue, 3-month U.S. Treasury securities.

INTEREST RATE ASSUMPTIONS (1945-84)

Year	Interest rate	Year	Interest rate
1945	0.375	1965	4.28
1946	0.375	1966	4.92
1947	0.594	1967	5.07
1948	1.040	1968	5.65
1949	1.102	1969	6.67
1950	1.218	1970	7.35
1951	1.552	1971	6.16
1952	1.766	1972	6.21
1953	2.85	1973	6.84
1954	2.40	1974	7.56
1955	2.82	1975	7.99
1956	3.18	1976	7.61
1957	3.65	1977	7.42
1958	3.32	1978	8.41
1959	4.33	1979	9.44
1960	4.12	1980	11.46
1961	3.88	1981	13.91
1962	3.95	1982	13.00
1963	4.00	1984	13.00
1964	4.19	1985	13.00

¹ Estimate.

Source: Economic Report of the President, February 1983.

Wage histories

Hypothetical wage histories were constructed covering the period 1945-1984 in accordance with the wage indexing series used by the Social Security Administration, i.e., the difference in each year's wage levels was attributable to the growth of average wages in the economy.

FEDERAL CAREER WAGE HISTORIES (1945-84)

Final year's earnings	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
High-3.....	\$9,415	\$18,831	\$28,247	\$37,663	\$47,078	\$56,494
1984.....	10,000	20,000	30,000	40,000	50,000	60,000
1983.....	9,316	18,632	27,948	37,264	46,580	55,896
1982.....	8,931	17,862	26,793	35,724	44,655	53,586
1981.....	8,460	16,920	25,380	33,840	42,300	50,760
1980.....	7,686	15,372	23,058	30,744	38,430	46,116
1979.....	7,051	14,102	21,153	28,204	35,255	42,306
1978.....	6,484	12,968	19,452	25,936	32,420	38,904
1977.....	6,006	12,012	18,018	24,024	30,030	36,036
1976.....	5,667	11,334	17,001	22,668	28,335	34,002
1975.....	5,302	10,604	15,906	21,208	26,510	31,812
1974.....	4,933	9,866	14,799	19,732	24,665	29,598
1973.....	4,656	9,312	13,968	18,624	23,280	27,936
1972.....	4,382	8,764	13,146	17,528	21,910	26,292
1971.....	3,991	7,982	11,973	15,964	19,955	23,946
1970.....	3,800	7,600	11,400	15,200	19,000	22,800
1969.....	3,620	7,240	10,860	14,480	18,100	21,720
1968.....	3,423	6,846	10,269	13,692	17,115	20,538
1967.....	3,202	6,404	9,606	12,808	16,010	19,212
1966.....	3,033	6,066	9,099	12,132	15,165	18,198
1965.....	2,862	5,724	8,586	11,448	14,310	17,172
1964.....	2,811	5,622	8,433	11,244	14,055	16,866
1963.....	2,701	5,402	8,103	10,804	13,505	16,206
1962.....	2,636	5,272	7,908	10,544	13,180	15,816
1961.....	2,510	5,020	7,530	10,040	12,550	15,060
1960.....	2,461	4,922	7,383	9,844	12,305	14,766
1959.....	2,369	4,738	7,107	9,476	11,845	14,214
1958.....	2,257	4,514	6,771	9,028	11,285	13,542
1957.....	2,237	4,474	6,711	8,948	11,185	13,422
1956.....	2,170	4,340	6,510	8,680	10,850	13,022
1955.....	2,028	4,056	6,084	8,112	10,140	12,168
1954.....	1,939	3,878	5,817	7,756	9,695	11,634
1953.....	1,928	3,856	5,784	7,712	9,640	11,568
1952.....	1,826	3,652	5,478	7,304	9,130	10,956
1951.....	1,719	3,438	5,151	6,876	8,595	10,314
1950.....	1,563	3,126	4,689	6,252	7,815	9,378
1949.....	1,525	3,050	4,575	6,100	7,625	9,150

FEDERAL CAREER WAGE HISTORIES (1945-84)—Continued

Final year's earnings	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
1948.....	1,451	2,902	4,353	5,804	7,255	8,706
1947.....	1,336	2,672	4,008	5,344	6,680	8,016
1946.....	1,162	2,324	3,486	4,648	5,810	6,972
1945.....	1,241	2,482	3,773	4,964	6,205	7,446

Calculation of annuity purchased with thrift plan accumulations

In order to determine the amount of an annuity that can be purchased for a given amount of principal, information on life expectancy of the annuitant is needed. The mortality rates used for this analysis were determined by the Office of Personnel Management and are for male civil service workers.

The accumulated value of the thrift plan was converted to an indexed annuity at the time of retirement (i.e. age 62 or 65) assum-

ing a 6 percent interest rate. The annuity is assumed to increase at 4 percent a year. Both the interest rate and the inflation rate are the same as the assumed long-term rates in the economy predicted in the 1982 Social Security Trustees' II-B assumptions.

The taxable portion of the annuity was determined in accordance with Internal Revenue Service regulations, section 1.72-9, using Table I, Ordinary Life Annuity—One Life—assuming no refund feature. The expected return multiples were based on males age 62 and 65.

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY 30-YEAR SERVICE: COMPARISON OF GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR CURRENT CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM AND REVISED SYSTEM

Final year's earnings	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Current CSRS:						
Single 62	53.0 (61.3)	53.0 (59.9)	53.0 (59.7)	53.0 (59.6)	53.0 (59.7)	53.0 (59.8)
Married 62	53.0 (61.3)	53.0 (60.3)	53.0 (59.8)	53.0 (60.1)	53.0 (60.3)	53.0 (60.4)
Single 65	53.0 (64.7)	53.0 (64.9)	53.0 (61.5)	53.0 (60.7)	53.0 (60.8)	53.0 (60.8)
Married 65	53.0 (61.3)	53.0 (65.0)	53.0 (65.0)	53.0 (62.7)	53.0 (61.8)	53.0 (61.8)
Revised system with thrift plan participation:						
Single 62	83.3 (105.4)	76.5 (96.9)	71.2 (92.6)	66.8 (88.6)	63.2 (83.2)	60.8 (78.6)
Married 62	99.2 (121.5)	89.3 (112.7)	81.5 (103.6)	75.1 (97.1)	69.9 (90.8)	66.4 (86.3)
Single 65	94.8 (121.5)	86.7 (111.1)	79.9 (105.1)	75.1 (100.7)	70.6 (92.7)	67.6 (87.6)
Married 65	115.1 (140.9)	103.0 (131.7)	93.0 (119.9)	85.8 (112.5)	79.2 (104.4)	74.8 (97.5)
Revised system without thrift plan participation:						
Single 62	65.0 (81.0)	58.2 (73.1)	52.9 (67.6)	48.5 (63.3)	44.9 (58.2)	42.5 (56.8)
Married 62	80.9 (95.6)	71.0 (88.5)	63.2 (79.6)	56.8 (72.4)	51.6 (65.9)	48.1 (62.0)
Single 65	74.6 (93.1)	66.4 (84.5)	59.7 (77.2)	54.9 (72.6)	50.4 (67.3)	47.4 (64.1)
Married 65	94.9 (112.0)	82.8 (103.8)	72.8 (92.8)	65.6 (84.7)	59.0 (76.6)	54.6 (71.5)

TABLE 2.—SUMMARY 40-YEAR SERVICE: COMPARISON OF GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR CURRENT CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM AND REVISED SYSTEM

Final year's earnings	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Current CSRS:						
Single 62	71.8 (80.4)	71.8 (78.5)	71.8 (77.4)	71.8 (76.7)	71.8 (76.0)	71.8 (75.2)
Married 62	71.8 (80.3)	71.8 (79.4)	71.8 (78.6)	71.8 (78.0)	71.8 (77.6)	71.8 (76.8)
Single 65	71.8 (87.7)	71.8 (81.8)	71.8 (78.8)	71.8 (78.0)	71.8 (77.3)	71.8 (76.5)
Married 65	71.8 (83.1)	71.8 (87.6)	71.8 (81.9)	71.8 (80.0)	71.8 (79.5)	71.8 (78.7)
Revised system with thrift plan participation:						
Single 62	98.7 (122.2)	91.9 (115.3)	86.6 (110.3)	82.2 (104.1)	78.6 (97.7)	76.2 (95.2)
Married 62	114.8 (139.1)	104.7 (129.4)	96.9 (121.2)	90.5 (114.8)	85.3 (106.3)	81.8 (99.6)
Single 65	111.4 (139.9)	103.3 (130.3)	96.5 (124.3)	91.7 (115.8)	87.2 (108.5)	84.2 (105.1)
Married 65	131.7 (161.2)	119.6 (149.9)	109.6 (139.0)	102.4 (131.1)	95.8 (131.1)	91.4 (112.0)
Revised system without thrift plan participation:						
Single 62	75.2 (92.4)	68.4 (84.1)	63.0 (79.2)	58.7 (75.2)	55.1 (71.0)	52.7 (67.3)
Married 62	91.1 (107.6)	81.2 (99.5)	73.4 (90.5)	67.0 (83.6)	61.8 (77.6)	58.3 (73.8)
Single 65	85.4 (106.5)	77.3 (96.2)	70.5 (89.7)	65.7 (85.3)	61.2 (79.4)	58.2 (74.4)
Married 65	105.7 (124.8)	93.6 (116.3)	83.6 (104.7)	76.4 (97.0)	68.8 (89.1)	65.4 (83.9)

TABLE 3.—CURRENT CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A SINGLE WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 62

Final year's salary	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-915	-2,392	-4,385	-6,827	-9,673	-12,839
State and local taxes	-197	-514	-943	-1,468	-2,080	-2,760
Civil service contribution	-700	-1,400	-2,100	-2,800	-3,500	-4,200
Net final earnings	8,188	15,694	22,572	28,905	34,747	40,201
Retirement income (40 yr):						
Civil service pension	7,180	14,359	21,538	28,718	35,897	43,077
Less taxes:						
Federal	-490	-1,673	-3,345	-5,380	-7,810	-10,561
State and local	-105	-360	-719	-1,157	-1,679	-2,271
Net retirement income	6,585	12,326	17,474	22,181	26,408	30,245
Gross replacement rates	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8
(Net) replacement rates	(80.4)	(78.5)	(77.4)	(76.7)	(76.0)	(75.2)
Retirement income (30 yr):						
Civil service pension	5,297	10,592	15,889	21,185	26,481	31,778

TABLE 3.—CURRENT CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A SINGLE WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 62—Continued

Less taxes:						
Federal	-229	-986	-1,979	-3,253	-4,709	-6,378
State and local	-49	-212	-425	-699	-1,012	-1,371
Net retirement income	5,019	9,394	13,485	17,233	20,760	24,029
Gross replacement rates	52.0	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0
(Net) replacement rates	(61.3)	(59.9)	(59.7)	(59.6)	(59.7)	(59.8)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining replacement rates.

TABLE 4.—CURRENT CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A MARRIED WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 62

Final year's salary	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-539	-1,885	-3,443	-5,434	-7,825	-10,456
States and local	-122	-426	-778	-1,228	-1,768	-2,363
Civil service contribution	-700	-1,400	-2,100	-2,800	-3,500	-4,200
Net final year's earnings	8,639	16,289	23,679	30,538	36,907	42,981
Retirement income (40 yrs):						
Civil service pension	7,180	14,359	21,538	28,718	35,897	43,077
Less taxes:						
Federal	-196	-1,158	-2,378	-3,995	-5,909	-8,213
State and local	-44	-262	-537	-903	-1,335	-1,856
Net retirement income	6,940	12,939	18,623	23,820	28,653	33,008
Gross replacement rates	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8
(Net) replacement rates	(80.3)	(79.4)	(78.6)	(78.0)	(77.6)	(76.8)
Retirement income (30 yrs):						
Civil service pension	5,297	10,592	15,889	21,185	26,481	31,778
Less taxes:						
Federal	-0	-622	-1,403	-2,314	-3,439	-4,760
State and local	-0	-141	-317	-530	-777	-1,076
Net retirement income	5,297	9,829	14,169	18,341	22,265	25,942
Gross replacement rates	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0
(Net) replacement rates	(61.3)	(60.3)	(59.8)	(60.1)	(60.3)	(60.4)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining replacement rates.

TABLE 5.—CURRENT CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A SINGLE WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 65

Final year's salary	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-915	-2,392	-4,385	-6,827	-9,673	-12,839
State and local taxes	-197	-514	-943	-1,468	-2,080	-2,760
Civil service contribution	-700	-1,400	-2,100	-2,800	-3,500	-4,200
Net final earnings	8,188	15,694	22,572	28,905	34,747	40,201
Retirement income (40 yr):						
Civil service pension	7,180	14,359	21,538	28,718	35,897	43,077
Less taxes:						
Federal	-0	-1,248	-3,085	-5,080	-7,438	-10,158
State and local	-0	-268	-663	-1,092	-1,599	-2,184
Net retirement income	7,180	12,843	17,790	22,546	26,860	30,735
Gross replacement rates	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8
(Net) replacement rates	(87.7)	(81.8)	(78.8)	(78.0)	(77.3)	(76.5)
Retirement income (30 yr):						
Civil service pension	5,297	10,592	15,889	21,185	26,481	31,778
Less taxes:						
Federal	-0	-332	-1,658	-2,993	-4,409	-6,038
State and local	-0	-71	-356	-644	-948	-1,298
Net retirement income	5,297	10,189	13,875	17,548	21,124	24,442
Gross replacement rates	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0
(Net) replacement rates	(64.7)	(64.9)	(61.5)	(60.7)	(60.8)	(60.8)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining replacement rates.

TABLE 6.—CURRENT CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A MARRIED WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 65

Final year's salary	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-539	-1,885	-3,443	-5,434	-7,825	-10,456
State and local	-122	-426	-778	-1,228	-1,768	-2,363
Civil service contribution	-700	-1,400	-2,100	-2,800	-3,500	-4,200
Net final year's earnings	8,639	16,289	23,679	30,538	36,907	42,981
Retirement income (40 yr):						
Civil service pension	7,180	14,359	21,538	28,718	35,897	43,077
Less taxes:						
Federal	0	-71	-1,758	-3,495	-5,349	-7,553
State and local	0	-16	-397	-790	-1,209	-1,707
Net retirement income	7,180	14,272	19,383	24,433	29,339	33,817
Gross replacement rates	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8
(Net) replacement rates	(83.1)	(87.6)	(81.9)	(80.0)	(79.5)	(78.7)
Retirement income (30 yr):						
Civil service pension	5,297	10,592	15,889	21,185	26,481	31,778
Less taxes:						
Federal	0	0	-400	-1,668	-2,999	-4,260
State and local	0	0	-90	-377	-678	-963
Net retirement income	5,297	10,592	15,399	19,140	22,804	26,555
Gross replacement rates	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0	53.0
(Net) replacement rates	(61.3)	(65.0)	(65.0)	(62.7)	(61.8)	(61.8)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining replacement rates.

TABLE 7.—REVISED RETIREMENT SYSTEM WITH 4 PERCENT INDEXED THRIFT PLAN: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A SINGLE WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 62

Final year's earnings (1984)	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-915	-2,392	-4,385	-6,827	-9,673	-12,839
State and local taxes	-197	-514	-943	-1,468	-2,080	-2,760
Social security—5.7 percent to \$37,800	-570	-1,140	-1,710	-2,154	-2,154	-2,154
Defined benefit contribution—3 percent	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Thrift plan—3 percent	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Net final earnings	7,718	14,754	21,151	27,151	33,093	38,647
Retirement income (40 yrs):						
Social security	3,444	5,532	6,696	7,188	7,188	7,188
Pension	4,071	8,143	12,214	16,285	20,357	24,428
Thrift plan	2,352	4,704	7,056	9,408	11,760	14,112
Total	9,867	18,379	25,966	32,881	39,305	45,728
Less taxes:						
Federal	-357	-1,122	-2,161	-3,792	-5,736	-7,368
State and local	-77	-241	-465	-815	-1,233	-1,584
Net retirement income	9,433	17,016	23,340	28,274	32,336	36,776
Gross replacement rate	98.7	91.9	86.6	82.2	78.6	76.2
(Net) replacement rate	(122.2)	(115.3)	(110.3)	(104.1)	(97.7)	(95.2)
Retirement income (30 yrs):						
Social security	3,444	5,532	6,696	7,188	7,188	7,188
Pension	3,054	6,107	9,161	12,214	15,267	18,321
Thrift plan	1,830	3,660	5,490	7,320	9,150	10,980
Total	8,328	15,299	21,347	26,722	31,605	36,489
Less taxes:						
Federal	-159	-824	-1,453	-2,189	-3,342	-5,019
State and local	-34	-177	-312	-471	-719	-1,079
Net retirement income	8,135	14,298	19,582	24,062	27,544	30,391
Gross replacement rate	83.3	76.5	71.2	66.8	63.2	60.8
(Net) replacement rate	(105.4)	(96.9)	(92.6)	(88.6)	(83.2)	(78.6)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining replacement rates.

TABLE 8.—REVISED RETIREMENT SYSTEM WITH 4 PERCENT INDEXED THRIFT PLAN: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A MARRIED WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 62

Final year's earnings (1984)	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-539	-1,885	-3,443	-5,434	-7,825	-10,456
State and local taxes	-122	-426	-778	-1,228	-1,768	-2,363
Social security—5.7 percent to \$37,800	-570	-1,140	-1,710	-2,154	-2,154	-2,154
Defined benefit contribution—3 percent	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Thrift plan—3 percent	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Net final year's earnings	-8,169	-15,349	-22,269	-28,784	-35,253	-41,427
Retirement income (40 yr):						
Social security	5,054	8,100	9,804	10,524	10,524	10,524
Pension	4,071	8,143	12,214	16,285	20,357	24,428
Thrift plan	2,352	4,704	7,056	9,408	11,760	14,112
Total	11,477	20,947	29,074	36,217	42,641	49,064
Less taxes:						
Federal	-92	-884	-1,709	-2,584	-4,217	-6,359
State and local	-21	-200	-386	-584	-953	-1,437
Net retirement income	11,364	19,863	26,979	33,049	37,471	41,268
Gross replacement rate	114.8	104.7	96.9	90.5	85.3	81.8
(Net) replacement rate	(139.1)	(129.4)	(121.2)	(114.8)	(106.3)	(99.6)
Retirement income (30 yr):						
Social security	5,040	8,100	9,804	10,524	10,524	10,524
Pension	3,054	6,107	9,161	12,214	15,267	18,321
Thrift plan	1,830	3,660	5,490	7,320	9,150	10,980
Total	9,924	17,867	24,455	30,058	34,941	39,825
Less taxes:						
Federal	0	-462	-1,123	-1,728	-2,379	-3,321
State and local	0	-104	-254	-391	-538	-751
Net retirement income	9,924	17,301	23,078	27,939	32,024	35,753
Gross replacement rate	99.2	89.3	81.5	75.1	69.9	66.4
(Net) replacement rate	(121.5)	(112.7)	(103.6)	(97.1)	(90.8)	(86.3)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining replacement rates.

TABLE 9.—REVISED RETIREMENT SYSTEM WITH 4 PERCENT INDEXED THRIFT PLAN: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR SINGLE WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 65

Final year's earnings (1984)	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-915	-2,392	-4,385	-6,827	-9,673	-12,839
State and local taxes	-197	-514	-943	-1,468	-2,080	-2,760
Social security tax—5.7 percent to \$37,800	-570	-1,140	-1,710	-2,154	-2,154	-2,154
Defined benefit contribution—3 percent	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Thrift plan—3 percent	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Net final year's earnings	7,718	14,754	21,162	27,151	33,093	38,647
Retirement income (40 yr):						
Social security	4,212	6,792	8,160	8,952	8,952	8,952
Pension	4,331	8,662	12,994	17,325	21,656	25,987
Thrift plan	2,598	5,196	7,794	10,392	12,990	15,588
Total retirement income	11,141	20,650	28,948	36,669	43,598	50,527
Less taxes:						
Federal	-284	-1,176	-2,184	-4,300	-6,318	-8,141

TABLE 9.—REVISED RETIREMENT SYSTEM WITH 4 PERCENT INDEXED THRIFT PLAN: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR SINGLE WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 65—Continued

State and local	-61	-253	-470	-925	-1,358	-1,750
Net retirement income	10,796	19,221	26,294	31,444	35,922	40,636
Gross replacement rate	111.4	103.3	96.5	91.7	87.2	84.2
(Net) replacement rate	(139.9)	(103.3)	(124.3)	(115.8)	(108.5)	(105.1)
Retirement income (30 yr):						
Social security	4,212	6,792	8,160	8,952	8,952	8,952
Pension	3,249	6,497	9,745	12,994	16,242	19,490
Thrift plan	2,022	4,044	6,066	8,088	10,110	12,132
Total	9,483	17,333	23,971	30,034	35,304	40,574
Less taxes:						
Federal	-86	-778	-1,426	-2,218	-3,799	-5,536
State and local	-18	-167	-307	-477	-817	-1,190
Net retirement income	9,379	16,388	22,238	27,339	30,688	33,848
Gross replacement rate	94.8	86.7	79.9	75.1	70.6	67.6
(Net) replacement rate	(121.5)	(111.1)	(105.1)	(100.7)	(92.7)	(87.6)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining rates.

TABLE 10.—REVISED RETIREMENT SYSTEM WITH 4 PERCENT THRIFT PLAN: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A MARRIED WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 65

Final year's earnings (1984)	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-539	-1,885	-3,443	-5,434	-7,825	-10,456
State and local taxes	-122	-426	-778	-1,228	-1,768	-2,363
Social security—5.7 percent to \$37,800	-570	-1,140	-1,710	-2,154	-2,154	-2,154
Defined benefit contribution—3 percent	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Thrift plan—3 percent	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Net final year's earnings	8,169	15,349	22,269	28,784	35,253	41,427
Retirement income (40 yr):						
Social security	6,240	10,056	12,084	13,248	13,248	13,248
Pension	4,331	8,662	12,994	17,325	21,656	25,987
Thrift plan	2,598	5,196	7,794	10,392	12,990	15,588
Total	13,169	23,914	32,872	40,965	47,894	54,823
Less taxes:						
Federal	0	-737	-1,565	-2,627	-4,643	-6,873
State and local	0	-167	-354	-594	-1,049	-1,553
Net retirement income	13,169	23,010	30,953	37,774	43,202	46,397
Gross replacement rate	131.7	119.6	109.6	102.4	95.8	91.4
(Net) replacement rate	(161.2)	(149.9)	(139.0)	(131.1)	(119.7)	(112.0)
Retirement income (30 yr):						
Social security	6,240	10,056	12,084	13,248	13,248	13,248
Pension	3,249	6,497	9,745	12,994	16,242	19,490
Thrift plan	2,022	4,044	6,066	8,088	10,110	12,132
Total	11,511	20,597	27,895	34,330	39,600	44,870
Less taxes:						
Federal	0	-310	-977	-1,588	-2,274	-3,667
State and local	0	-70	-221	-359	-514	-829
Net retirement income	11,511	20,217	26,697	32,383	36,812	40,374
Gross replacement rate	115.1	103.0	93.0	85.8	79.2	74.8
(Net) replacement rate	(140.9)	(131.7)	(119.9)	(112.5)	(104.4)	(97.5)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining replacement rates.

TABLE 11.—REVISED RETIREMENT SYSTEM WITHOUT PARTICIPATING IN THRIFT PLAN: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A SINGLE WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 62

Final year's earnings (1984)	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-915	-2,392	-4,385	-6,827	-9,673	-12,839
State and local taxes	-197	-514	-943	-1,468	-2,080	-2,760
Social security—5.7 percent to \$37,800	-570	-1,140	-1,710	-2,154	-2,154	-2,154
Defined benefit contribution—3 percent	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Net final earnings	8,018	15,354	22,062	28,351	34,593	40,447
Retirement income (40 yr):						
Social security	3,444	5,532	6,696	7,188	7,188	7,188
Pension	4,071	8,143	12,214	16,285	20,357	24,428
Total	7,515	13,675	18,910	23,473	27,545	31,616
Less taxes:						
Federal taxes	-85	-631	-1,188	-1,769	-2,455	-3,626
State and local	-18	-136	-255	-380	-528	-780
Net retirement income	7,412	12,908	17,467	21,324	24,562	27,210
Gross replacement rates	75.2	68.4	63.0	58.7	55.1	52.7
(Net) replacement rates	(92.4)	(84.1)	(79.2)	(75.2)	(71.0)	(67.3)
Retirement income (30 yr):						
Social security	3,444	5,532	6,696	7,188	7,188	7,188
Pension	3,054	6,107	9,161	12,214	15,267	18,321
Total	6,498	11,639	15,857	19,402	22,455	25,509
Less taxes:						
Federal	0	-340	-784	-1,188	-1,612	-2,095
State and local	0	-73	-169	-255	-347	-450
Net retirement income	6,498	11,226	14,904	17,959	20,496	22,964
Gross replacement rate	65.0	58.2	52.9	48.5	44.9	42.5
(Net) replacement rate	(81.0)	(73.1)	(67.6)	(63.3)	(59.2)	(56.8)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining replacement rates.

TABLE 12.—REVISED RETIREMENT SYSTEM WITHOUT PARTICIPATING IN THRIFT PLAN: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A MARRIED WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 62

Final year's earnings	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-539	-1,885	-3,443	-5,434	-7,825	-10,456
State and local taxes	-122	-426	-778	-1,228	-1,768	-2,363
Social security—5.7 percent to \$37,800	-570	-1,140	-1,710	-2,154	-2,154	-2,154
Defined benefit contribution	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Net final year's earnings	8,469	15,949	23,169	29,984	36,753	43,227
Retirement income (40 yr):						
Social security	5,040	8,100	9,804	10,524	10,524	10,524
Pension	4,071	8,143	12,214	16,285	20,357	24,428
Total	9,111	16,243	22,018	26,809	30,881	34,952
Less taxes:						
Federal	0	-308	-849	-1,411	-1,935	-2,497
State and local	0	-70	-192	-319	-437	-564
Net retirement income	9,111	15,865	20,977	25,079	28,509	31,891
Gross replacement rates	91.1	81.2	73.4	67.0	61.8	58.3
(Net) replacement rates	(107.6)	(99.5)	(90.5)	(83.6)	(77.6)	(73.8)
Retirement income (30 yr):						
Social security	5,040	8,100	9,804	10,524	10,524	10,524
Pension	3,054	6,107	9,161	12,214	15,267	18,321
Total	8,094	14,207	18,965	22,738	25,791	28,845
Less taxes:						
Federal	0	-78	-430	-849	-1,286	-1,662
State and local	0	-18	-97	-192	-291	-376
Net retirement income	8,094	14,111	18,438	21,697	24,214	26,807
Gross replacement rate	80.9	71.0	63.2	56.8	51.6	48.1
(Net) replacement rate	(95.6)	(88.5)	(79.6)	(72.4)	(65.9)	(62.0)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining replacement rates.

TABLE 13.—REVISED SYSTEM WITHOUT PARTICIPATING IN THE THRIFT PLAN: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR SINGLE WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 65

Final year's earnings	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-915	-2,392	-4,385	-6,827	-9,673	-12,839
State and local taxes	-197	-514	-943	-1,468	-2,080	-2,760
Social security—5.7 percent to \$37,800	-570	-1,140	-1,710	-2,154	-2,154	-2,154
Defined benefit contribution	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Net final year's earnings	8,018	15,354	22,062	28,351	34,593	40,447
Retirement income (40 yr):						
Social security	4,212	6,792	8,160	8,952	8,952	8,952
Pension	4,331	8,662	12,994	17,325	21,656	25,987
Total	8,543	15,454	21,154	26,277	30,608	34,939
Less taxes:						
Federal	-3	-559	-1,124	-1,729	-2,585	-3,996
State and local	-1	-120	-242	-372	-556	-859
Net retirement income	8,539	14,775	19,788	24,176	27,467	30,084
Gross replacement rate	85.4	77.3	70.5	65.7	61.2	58.2
(Net) replacement rate	(106.5)	(96.2)	(89.7)	(85.3)	(79.4)	(74.4)
Retirement income (30 yr):						
Social security	4,212	6,792	8,160	8,952	8,952	8,952
Pension	3,249	6,497	9,745	12,994	16,242	19,490
Total	7,461	13,289	17,905	21,946	25,194	28,442
Less taxes:						
Federal	0	-255	-722	-1,124	-1,564	-2,072
State and local	0	-55	-155	-242	-336	-445
Net retirement income	7,461	12,979	17,028	20,580	23,294	25,925
Gross replacement rate	74.6	66.4	59.7	54.9	50.4	47.4
(Net) replacement rate	(93.1)	(84.5)	(77.2)	(72.6)	(67.3)	(64.1)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining replacement rates.

TABLE 14.—REVISED SYSTEM WITHOUT PARTICIPATING IN THRIFT PLAN: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A MARRIED WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 65

Final year's earnings (1984)	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$60,000
Less:						
Federal taxes	-539	-1,885	-3,443	-5,434	-7,825	-10,456
State and local taxes	-122	-426	-778	-1,228	-1,768	-2,363
Social security—5.7 percent to \$37,800	-570	-1,140	-1,710	-2,154	-2,154	-2,154
Defined benefit contribution—3 percent	-300	-600	-900	-1,200	-1,500	-1,800
Net final year's earnings	8,469	15,949	23,169	29,984	36,753	43,227
Retirement income (40 yrs):						
Social security	6,240	10,056	12,084	13,248	13,248	13,248
Pension	4,331	8,662	12,994	17,325	21,656	25,987
Total	10,571	18,718	25,078	30,573	34,904	39,235
Less taxes:						
Federal	0	-139	-678	-1,219	-1,755	-2,410
State and local	0	-31	-153	-275	-397	-545
Net retirement income	10,571	18,548	24,247	29,079	32,752	36,280
Gross replacement rates	105.7	93.6	83.6	76.4	69.8	65.4
(Net) replacement rates	(124.8)	(116.3)	(104.7)	(97.0)	(89.1)	(83.9)
Retirement income (30 yr):						
Social security	6,240	10,056	12,084	13,248	13,248	13,248
Pension	3,249	6,497	9,745	12,994	16,242	19,490
Total	9,489	16,553	21,829	26,242	29,490	32,738

TABLE 14.—REVISED SYSTEM WITHOUT PARTICIPATING IN THRIFT PLAN: GROSS AND (NET) EARNINGS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR A MARRIED WORKER RETIRING IN 1985 AT AGE 65—
Continued

Less taxes:						
Federal	0	0	-260	-678	-1,086	-1,486
State and local	0	0	-59	-153	-245	-336
Net retirement income	9,489	16,553	21,510	25,411	28,159	30,916
Gross replacement rate	94.9	82.8	72.8	65.6	59.0	54.6
(Net) replacement rate	(112.0)	(103.8)	(92.8)	(84.7)	(76.6)	(71.5)

Note: See methodology section for assumptions used in determining replacement rates. ●

DISCRIMINATION AT SHORT BROTHERS, BELFAST**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, I sent a letter to Verne Orr, Secretary of the Air Force, protesting the proposed purchase of transport aircraft—(SD330)—from Short Brothers, Ltd., in Belfast, Ireland. Short Brothers, a British Government-owned corporation, has a record of anti-Catholic discrimination. We outlined our protest in the letter, which 26 Members cosigned.

The response from the Air Force made no attempt to refute the statistics of discrimination. They made no reference to the problem of discrimination except to assure us that Short Brothers had received approval from the Fair Employment Agency, a British agency which enforces antidiscrimination laws in Northern Ireland.

The British Ambassador has also defended Short Brothers to Members of Congress, and defended their right to the Air Force contract. However, the Ambassador made no attempt to refute the figures we presented that show Short Brothers' discriminatory practices.

I would like to enter into the RECORD a critique of the British defense of Short Brothers by Rev. Brian Brady of St. Joseph's College in Belfast. Father Brady has provided some of the most cogent proof so far of the anti-Catholic discrimination in Northern Ireland. His arguments are well-substantiated and compelling:

A CRITIQUE OF THE "COVER-UP" OF ANTI-CATHOLIC DISCRIMINATION IN SHORT BROTHERS, BELFAST

(By Rev. Brian J. Brady, St. Joseph's College of Education, Belfast, Northern Ireland, May 26, 1983)

The case study gave facts and figures in support of the allegation that Short Brothers discriminates against Catholics in its employment practices. The allegation stands until the statistics on which it is based are rebutted by equally true facts and figures. So far no such rebuttal has been produced by the apologists for Shorts and I am confident that none can be produced.

On May 10 the British Ambassador assumed the role of apologist for the company. He wrote to Congressional leaders and enclosed briefing material from Shorts. Nei-

ther that material nor the Ambassador's covering letter constitute an adequate response to the case against the company. Both documents are really denials of my allegation, in the form of assertions unsupported by hard facts.

I should like to offer some detailed comments on the inadequacies of the package as a "case for the defense" of Shorts. The case has three parts to it:

1. That employment practices in the company satisfy fully the requirements of the Fair Employment Act (NI) 1976 and that the company co-operates completely with the Fair Employment Agency (FEA) in achieving the purposes of the agency.

The supporting "facts" offered are:
a. A photostat of the FEA Certificate that Shorts has signed the Declaration of Intent to promote and protect equality of opportunity in employment.

Response. May I point out that signing the FEA Declaration does not commit the signatory firm to any time scale in remedying its past discriminatory practices. In the case of Shorts the imbalance of Protestants (95%) and Catholics (5%) has not changed one iota in the 4 years since the certificate was granted by FEA.

b. It is pointed out that three unsuccessful complaints of discrimination by individuals employed by the firm made to the FEA are proof that there is no discrimination against employees of the firm.

Response. The allegation made by me was not that Catholics employed by the company were discriminated against. My complaint was that Catholics were excluded (apart from token 5%) from working for the firm at all.

c. Two remedial programs by the company are mentioned:

A program of action to ensure equality of opportunity in the company which is allegedly 15 years in place;

An affirmative action program to remedy the imbalance in the workforce.

Response. Programs must be judged by their results. If these are really serious efforts to remedy an injustice, whose existence is implied by the very existence of the programs, why has the Protestant/Catholic imbalance in the workforce not been ameliorated? It is unacceptable to say that polarization over the past 14 years is responsible for the imbalance. What was happening during the 32 years between 1937 and 1968? In connection with these programs, may I suggest that the Chairman of FEA, Mr. Bob Cooper, be asked to explain the involvement of his agency in them and to give a statistical account of their success or failure in making Shorts an equal opportunity employer. It is facts and figures from FEA, not worthless certificates, which must be offered.

2. The second item of briefing material issues by Shorts in its defense is a letter to the Managing Director from the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering

Unions. The letter denies that the firm pursues a policy of religious discrimination.

Response. The Confederation has never done anything to redress the injustice of Catholics having only 4.8% of the jobs in the shipbuilding, marine engineering and aircraft industries serviced by its unions. The Confederation is not and never has been interested in the employment rights of Catholics. In this context, its letter is a cruel joke.

3. This third line of defense offered by Shorts is the purchase of one 330 aircraft by AVAIR, a subsidiary of the semi-state Irish Airlines (Aer Lingus). Apparently one is expected to infer that Shorts is a fair employer because of semi-state body in the Republic of Ireland purchases its products.

Response. Unfortunately the Government of the Republic of Ireland has not, up to the present, made the absence of anti-Catholic discrimination a condition of giving contracts to N. Ireland firms. Indeed it has caused much distress in the Catholic community in N. Ireland during the past week, by authorizing another of its semi-state bodies (Bord na Mona Peat Development Board) to purchase £¼M worth of goods from Sirocco Engineering of Belfast. Sirocco has 4 Catholic employees in a workforce of 850 to 900 (See copy of my letter to the media on this matter). The Government of the Republic of Ireland, as a defense witness for Shorts, collapses under cross-examination.

The Ambassador's letter is as short on hard data in support of Short's case as is the company's own briefing material. I submit that my original allegation against Short's supported by facts and figures, has not been disproved. The company still stands exposed as a firm which discriminates against Catholics.

Purchasers of Shorts' products must be left under no illusion about their complicity in that anti-Catholic discrimination. It would be most unfortunate if any agency of the U.S. Government should get involved in the purchase of aircraft from Shorts at this time.

Since this paper has been written, eighteen electricians have been hired by Shorts Brothers. Only one is Catholic. ●

A TRIBUTE TO THE HIGH SCHOOL ARTISTS**HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to all of the high school artists from around the country whose works of art now grace the Cap-

itol tunnel. Their outstanding talent and dedication is reflected in these works of art and they are surely a welcome addition to the tunnel. I would especially like to offer my congratulations to the artist representing the Fourth District of West Virginia, Stephanie Midkiff of Lashmeet, W. Va., who was unable to attend the dedication ceremony and reception last night. Her acrylic "Butterfly Spirit" proudly hangs alongside of the other fine works of art and I am proud to have Stephanie's acrylic representing my congressional district. While I wish that Stephanie and her family could have made it to Washington for the reception, hopefully, she will be able to see her painting hanging in the Capitol tunnel. Once again, my congratulations to all of these fine young artists.●

THE DEDICATION OF A WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL MARKER

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD a speech made by Massachusetts State Senator John F. Parker at the dedication of a trail memorial marker in honor of World War I veterans. The dedication took place at Bourne National Cemetery at Otis Air Force Base on Cape Cod. More than 400 World War I veterans were on hand for this ceremonial unveiling of a granite World War I trail marker memorial. This monument is 5 feet high and has a bronze plaque with two verses of "Flanders Field" and sponsorship to all veterans of World War I. Mr. Parker's speech was very well received and many were even moved to tears as the senator told stories about the "war to end all wars."

ADDRESS OF STATE SENATOR JOHN F. PARKER AT DEDICATION OF WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL MARKER, NATIONAL CEMETERY, OTIS AIR BASE, BOURNE, MASS.

The year 1914 was a long time ago, almost 70 years and Europe was a long way from America, some 3,000 miles reached only by steamship for there were no swift airlines at that time and in 1914, American seemed safe and isolated from mounting troubles of the European nations and the rising military power of Imperial Germany, under Kaiser Wilhelm.

Even when a little known Serbian Archduke was assassinated, triggering World War I, it made little impression on the United States, for hadn't George Washington told us many decades before to stay out of foreign entanglements and that was good enough for us.

So, when Europe erupted into full-scale warfare in 1914, and German Army hordes decimated the smaller nations and pounded relentlessly at France and Great Britain, we watched and commiserated with Britain and France, but considered no action that might involve the United States in open

conflict with Germany. In fact, we did little to prepare this nation for the eventuality of warfare. The terrible tragedy of the Civil War, fought only 50 years before and which killed almost 600,000 young soldiers of the north and south, had dimmed our view of armed conflict. We wanted no more of it and this was reflected in our military forces, both army and navy, far below the standards of the times.

Germany, with its manpower might, its vast submarine and surface fleets was awesome. Nothing in America could compare with this tremendous war machine. It was frightening and as the months rolled on from 1914 into 1915 and 1916, we read about this German juggernaut, that it was grinding down the flower of the armies of England, France, Belgium and other nations of Europe. We read about the submarine fleets that smashed to the bottom, millions of tons of shipping bringing starvation and panic to European nations. We read about the front lines of France, where brave soldiers were killed by the thousands just for a few yards of muddy turf and we heard the term "No Man's Land" which told us that neither side owned the territory, it was just a slaughterhouse.

It was a situation beyond belief. The blood of a whole generation of French, British and German soldiers was being poured out from Flanders to Verdun. The death toll was simply awful and nobody winning anything.

Slowly, America came to realize it had to help Britain and France with food and supplies, and we did. Shipping millions of tons of needed supplies to these nations, until Germany declared unrestricted submarine warfare against all shipping, no matter under which flag the ship was registered.

The great liner Lusitania went down, carrying with it many Americans. The American anguish was very great and continued so, as more ships were torpedoed and our rights to the high seas violated.

Slowly, the great American patriotic giant started to awaken. We were horrified at stories of German atrocities and it all came to a head on April 7, 1917, when President Woodrow Wilson and Congress declared war on Germany and its allies.

On that fateful night before Congress, President Wilson gravely stated: "It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance, but the right is more precious than peace..."

One sentence above all stood out, and people remembered from President Wilson's war message, "The world must be made safe for democracy."

President Wilson also summoned the youth of America into the most bloody of all wars in human history up to that time. Before the armistice was signed, millions of men and women entered the armed forces with nearly 2 million reaching France and the Western Front.

The patriotic fever that blanketed America completely baffled the Imperial German High Command. They had calculated that America would not, and could not mount a military presence and power in Europe.

When Congress voted its War Resolution in April of 1917, the nation had little idea what this momentous step involved. The general assumption was that the allies needed food and supplies and that there were enough men in France and Britain to do the fighting and it was further thought that most of the American involvement

would be on the high seas with the navy doing most of the fighting.

A debate raged in Congress as to whether or not recruits should be drafted and all this time the Big Bertha guns and finely trained German soldiers were grinding down still further British and French divisions in the field and there was a question could Britain and France hold out until American aid arrived.

President Wilson proclaimed that all young men must register for the draft, and on June 5, 1917, nine million men registered.

Then came the burden of creating an army on short notice. National Guard units were mobilized. Training camps were constructed and America rushed into an all-out war effort.

The gigantic American mobilization in the Spring of 1917 would be to no avail if the sea lanes of the Atlantic were blocked. The Germans were sinking almost a million tons of shipping a month and the British Admiralty predicted that unless the losses were stopped, Germany would win the war, as the stepped-up German submarine attack destroyed allied shipping in every sea lane.

No one can ever imagine, unless he was there, in those American destroyers and submarine chasers out on Atlantic duty, how vicious were the elements, as they tracked down German subs in weather beyond description.

Anyone who was in the navy during those perilous days in the bitter cold and through a winter of the worst storms in decades would attest that these were the worst days of their lives. But they went after the enemy, no matter where. Securing sea lanes for shipping and guiding our troop convoys to European ports.

The miracle of all was the transport of more than 2 million soldiers in 1,142 sailings across 3,000 miles of dangerous waters, in what became known as a bridge of ships, as the two navies, Great Britain and the United States so effectively guarded them and brought them safely to their destination with a minimum of losses.

And what about the 2 million men who made it to the other side, the United States soldiers of World War I, the doughboys?

They had left the states to the cheers of the populace. The songs "Over There, Over there, The Yanks Are Coming," "Smile, Darn You Smile," "K-K-K-Katy," and the cry of "Lafayette, We are Here" echoed through Paris as the first contingent of American troops marched down the Champs Elysee on July 4, 1917.

Germany never imagined that America could do what it was doing. Put 2 million combat soldiers in the field, adequately supplied and ready for action.

The Germans had 250 divisions against less than 170 allied divisions and General Pershing was not certain he could handle those odds, but he was insistent that the American presence be on its own, that the war could never be won in the trenches. Someday, somebody had to move forward and break the stalemate, attack the Germans. Trench warfare was not for Black Jack, it was over the top and get it done.

When the fighting mounted, one million two hundred thousand American soldiers hurled themselves across the rugged terrain of the Meuse-Argonne region, against fiercely-defending Germans in what was to become a death struggle for Imperial Germany. For 47 days the Americans attacked through a vast network of barbed wire, deep ravines, dense woods, myriads of shellholes and what not. It was the brutality of war-

fare in all its total savagery. In Belleau Wood alone 8,000 marines were reduced to less than 2,000.

The names of Sedan, St. Mihiel, Chateau Thierry, The Marne, The Anise River, The Meuse, Montfaucon, Verdun, Metz, Very, are only a few along the way of American Expeditionary involvement in the gigantic struggle to destroy the German armies and the price paid for those victories, and many other on land, sea and in the air, are recorded in blood and bravery on a thousand historical documents about World War I.

No one who was in it will ever forget. The angry seas for the navy, the desperate air battles for our fliers against the Red Baron and other German aces, and the mud, the filth, the stench, the cooties and lice, the desperation, the gas, the incessant shelling and terrible death at a thousand disputed barricades.

No one should ever forget the cost in treasure and manpower before Germany signed the armistice and war ended on November 11, 1918.

From 1914 until the armistice, more than 29 nations were involved in World War I, with a total of 65 million servicemen and women of all nations. An awesome 8 million were killed and other casualties reached 21 million. The devastation and cost were beyond calculation.

United States military losses alone reached 126,000 killed, 234,000 wounded and gassed, 4,500 prisoners and missing. It was the most terrible time of carnage and savagery and destruction ever known up to that time and it should never be forgotten what men and nations can do under the frightful stress of war and how brave and courageous men can be under fire.

It is also proper to take note of the sacrifices by the young men and women of America and Massachusetts who lie in this hallowed resting place and in the cemeteries of France and the world. To perpetuate their memory by the dedication of a suitable monument as an on-going reminder of the hard and difficult days of 65 years ago.

It is well that we remember also Massachusetts' contribution to the winning of World War I.

From this state alone, more than 200,000 men and women went into military service. Massachusetts contributions to the prosecution of the war was second to none among states of the Union.

The 26th Yankee Division, organized in Boston on August 22, 1917, was the first full America division to land in France. It received and effected tremendous casualties in the Meuse-Argonne offensive and elsewhere and spent an unbelievable 210 days on the front lines. Its casualty total reached more than 5,000 gassed, 1,500 wounded, nearly 2,000 killed and again and again its infantry regiments were cited for outstanding service against the enemy.

Massachusetts men were in many other divisions as well and their records in combat are indelibly emblazoned forever in the annals of the magnificent fighting units from every section of the nation. More than 5,000 gave their lives.

The State House in Boston is a repository for many of the memorable honors that came to Massachusetts servicemen during those hectic days of World War I. A memorial to four Massachusetts Chaplains who lost their lives in combat, the names of four men who received the Congressional Medal of Honor; Charles W. Whittlesley, who commanded the famous lost battalion, Michael J. Perkins, Charles Dilboy and Ralph

Talbot. A plaque to the memory of Lieutenant Norman Prince, who founded the famed Lafayette Escadrille. The first shell fired against Germany by a Massachusetts National Guard Unit, World War I flags and banners, honor shields and tablets, and above all the magnificent mural of the decoration by France with the Croix De Guerre of the 104th Infantry Regiment of the 26th Division, the first such distinction to come to an American infantry unit. All of these are now silent reminders of that terrible time so long ago when the flower of our youth went overseas to fight to make the world a safe place for democracy.

Time, in its inexorable march, has taken most of the braver men and women of World War I to the great camp site in the sky and we meet here today, in this month of June, so long after, to dedicate a monument in their honor and memory. It is a fitting thing to do, so noble, so satisfying and so right and just.

To the men and women of World War I, we owe so very much. They did make the world safe for democracy. By facing the enemies of freedom and liberty. They did not fail, and brought victory and peace in their time.

It is little enough to remember them in perpetuity. They knew the tragedy and pity of war. The senselessness of it, the madness, the grief, the tears and heartache that it brought to millions of families of whatever nation, friend or foe.

So, we pay tribute to them. Not as conquerors, but as soldiers, sailors, marines, airmen, nurses of America, who believed in a righteous cause, marched off and did their bit, or more than that, gave their lives in the holocaust of death and destruction of the Western Front or on the high seas.

Permit me to close out this high honor you have given me to be the principal speaker at this dedication by leaving you with an old World War I poem, written by an anonymous soldier-doughboy, who put it this way:

Our country called us to the colors, and we gladly went
With a smile on our lips, and on victory bent.

The Kaiser was our enemy; we all knew that
And we figured he would run when he saw our tin hats.

It didn't work that way, and it was tougher'n hell
Surviving the filth, the gas, the horror and the smell.

The war was no picnic and the casualties ran high
Wonderful young Americans, who were not eager to die.

It should not be forgotten what the doughboys did here
In this frightful world of explosions, agony and fear

Across no-man's land; that terrible blood-red strip
Where sharpnel tore at bodies and machine guns zippered.

Shell holes tell the story, half of them filled with blood,
The sky's afire, the bullets hail as we wallow through the mud

We checked the men still living and then we knew full well
That in those awful moments, more than half the regiment fell.

But we won it for democracy, beating the Germans all the way
And the price was white crosses from Sassions to Seiprechey

So remember us kindly, the doughboys who turned the tide

Ask God to love and keep us, forever at his side.●

CONSTRUCTION OF COAL SLURRY CLOSE TO REALITY

HON. JAMES F. McNULTY, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, the construction of coal slurry pipelines as a mode of delivering cheaper energy to American citizens and lessening our dependence on foreign suppliers is close to reaching reality. H.R. 1010, which provides eminent domain for the construction of coal slurry pipelines has passed both the House Public Works Committee and the Interior Committee, and will soon be scheduled for a vote on the floor.

In light of that fact, I would like to have the following articles reprinted in the RECORD.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic, June 25, 1983]

AN OK FOR COAL SLURRY?

If Congress approves coal slurry pipelines—and it now seems closer than at any time in the past 20 years—this would cut the delivery price of Western low-sulfur coals.

More utilities across the country would buy cleaner Western coal, eventually generating greater income and jobs for the West.

Arizona produces 12.5 million tons a year, all on the Navajo Indian reservation.

Coal-fired plants produce more than half of all U.S. electricity.

Railroads, fighting to keep their high-volume coal traffic, have managed to defeat pipeline developers for two decades.

They are still attempting to block the pipelines—carrying a 50-50 mixture of coal and water through mostly underground lines—from crossing railroad rights-of-way.

Western coal and pipeline interests are trying to use the power of eminent domain.

One reason why the bill has a chance of passage is that much of Western agriculture's past fear of losing irrigation water to slurry has been calmed.

Reps. Richard Cheney, R-Wyo., and Morris Udall, D-Ariz., have written a measure that gives the states authority over water used in interstate coal slurry pipelines.

No firm may purchase water for slurry without state approval.

In some cases, moving coal by pipeline is half that of rail rates.

In all instances, the new delivery method offers savings to customers.

Coal slurry pipelines should make both the railroads and slurry lines more cost-efficient.

Such efficiency should help coal better compete with nuclear and oil energy.

The United States has hundreds of years of energy resources in its coal deposits.

Western coal is relatively clean-burning.

After two decades, the time for coal slurry pipelines has finally arrived.

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Citizen,
June 29, 1983]

CONSUMER RELIEF

There's nothing like a little competition to bring down prices. That's why the railroads have fought for years to keep pipelines from being built that would carry coal slurry—a mixture of coal and water.

Such pipelines can't be built without federal eminent domain authority that would allow the pipelines to cross railroad property. A bill now being considered in Congress, the Coal Pipeline Act, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights of way for coal slurry pipelines.

Arizona Reps. Morris Udall and James McNulty support the bill because it would give the railroads some competition and an incentive to hold down their coal-hauling rates, which have risen steadily over the past few years. Higher transportation costs are passed on to consumers by the electric companies that use coal to generate power.

In addition, Udall estimates that slurry pipeline projects could create up to 500,000 new private-sector jobs.

The railroads have succeeded for nearly 20 years in blocking coal slurry pipelines. But this year, with coal companies, utilities, consumer groups and labor all working for the bill, that opposition finally could be derailed. ●

H.R. 2817, A BILL TO AMEND THE CLEAN WATER ACT

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I was asked to testify before the House Public Works Subcommittee on Water Resources on H.R. 2817, a bill I introduced earlier this year that would provide funds for the cleanup of the Chesapeake Bay.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN ROY DYSON

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, I am here today to testify on behalf of H.R. 2817, a bill I introduced earlier this year that would amend the Clean Water Act to provide for the enhanced water quality of the Chesapeake and Narragansett Bays.

The Chesapeake Bay in one of our nation's most cherished and valuable natural resources. It is the largest and most productive estuary in the contiguous United States, with a drainage area of nearly 64,000 square miles in size, that includes parts of 6 states and the District of Columbia. Its primary tributaries, the Susquehanna, the Potomac and the James River, are major river systems in their own right.

The Bay's significance extends beyond its size, to its importance for the seafood, waterborne commerce and water-oriented industries that are vital to the middle Atlantic states. I am particularly aware of this because of my responsibilities as the representative of Maryland's First Congressional District, which surrounds the largest portion of the Chesapeake Bay.

These local interests are complemented by the impact that the Bay has on the nation as a whole. Its fishing production is surpassed only by that in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, with an annual dockside value

in excess of \$100 million. Commercial shipping interests carried nearly 239 million tons of cargo via the Chesapeake in 1981, estimated at nearly \$27.5 billion.

One of the Bay's most valuable roles is its function as a wildlife and aquatic habitat. Its tributaries are important places of reproduction for a variety of species of anadromous fish, like the shad and striped bass. In fact, almost 90 percent of the striped bass along the Atlantic Coast spawn in the Chesapeake's waters.

These facts indicated why the environmental quality of the Bay is so important to the region and the nation. As you probably know, next month the Environmental Protection Agency completes its seven-year, \$27 million study of the Chesapeake Bay's water quality. The study answers many of the most pressing questions about the condition of the Bay, but those answers only point to how much more remains to be done.

Research findings have identified three areas of serious concern: Toxics, nutrient enrichment and declining Bay grasses. These findings indicate that the main stem of this 195-mile long estuary is losing oxygen. In addition, the upper reaches of the main tributaries are considerably more stressed than scientists originally thought. All of these trends—the decline of the Bay grasses; the increased nutrient and attendant loss of oxygen; and the continued loading of toxic chemicals and heavy metals into Bay waters—portend serious problems by the end of the century.

The Bay grasses that once stretched from shore to shore are nearly gone. Commercial landings of striped bass plunged from five million pounds in 1973 to less than one million pounds in 1979. Shad, once harvested in huge numbers, and now so scarce that there is a rule against catching and keeping them in Maryland. In general, the fish that migrate each year to spawn in the Chesapeake Bay are disappearing.

This decline in water quality and subsequent loss of aquatic life has been principally the result of non-point source pollution; that is, agricultural and urban runoff, usually from heavy rainfall. Each year the Bay receives 400 million gallons of sewage and some 2,000 tons of metals and symbolic compounds, including sediments, fertilizers and herbicides.

Given the EPA findings, it is essential that we have a shared federal and state commitment to clean up the Chesapeake Bay. Management strategies for the Bay have been developed. A massive data base has been assembled to define trends in water quality variables and living resources over a 30 year time period for the Bay and its tributaries. There is only the need to establish a mechanism for implementing the Bay management strategies and to monitor their environmental results. I believe my legislation would provide that mechanism and the incentive for the states of Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia to develop and implement an interstate Bay Management Plan.

My legislation will provide a maximum of \$10 million in federal funds in each of the next four fiscal years to help the states turn their water pollution reduction plan into action. The federal grant money, to be administered by the EPA, will cover up to 55 percent of the total cost of implementing the plan in each state. Therefore, each state would have to contribute at least 45 percent.

The federal commitment to a healthier Chesapeake Bay must not end merely because the states are now the first line of de-

fense against this water pollution problem. As the country's largest and most productive estuary, the Chesapeake Bay is as much a federal concern as a local one.

My bill also includes a \$3 million authorization to insure that the EPA continues to conduct research and monitor changing conditions in the Bay. Special attention would be paid to the effect of pollutant loadings on the dwindling striped bass population.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note today that my bill has received the support the entire Maryland and Virginia Congressional delegations and over half of the members from Pennsylvania, three of whom are members of this subcommittee. In addition, the governors of Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia have all publicly endorsed the bill.

This high level of interest from federal and state officials in the Chesapeake Bay region represents an unprecedented effort to deal with the Bay's problems. We have begun to recognize that there is a mutual interest among the needs of all parties in the region. Residents on the Bay worry about non-point source pollution harming the aquatic life. Farmers who live near the Bay or in the Susquehanna Valley are concerned with finding ways to save money on fertilizer and improving their productivity by preventing further soil erosion. Problems such as these have too often been seen as being mutually exclusive and therefore incapable of a comprehensive solution. My bill initiates the kind of coordinated approach that begins the process of dealing with runoff and its harmful effect not only on the Chesapeake Bay, but on our farmland.

Finally, my legislation would provide \$1.5 million in each of five fiscal years for the EPA to conduct research assessing the principal factors having an adverse effect on the environmental quality of the Narragansett Bay in Rhode Island. My bill also requires the Administrator of EPA to establish a mechanism for improving the collection, storage, analysis and dissemination of water quality data on the Narragansett Bay.

Mr. Chairman and fellow Colleagues, the Clean Water Act is our nation's major legislative vehicle to improve water quality. The Chesapeake Bay, as our nation's largest and most productive estuary, warrants protection under its statutes. My legislation represents an important first step towards improving the Bay's water quality and assuring future generations that the Chesapeake Bay will continue to be a productive center for economic development and aquatic life. I urge its inclusion in this year's reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would gladly answer any questions you may have. ●

A TRIBUTE TO RICHARD W. MACWHORTER

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Richard W. MacWhorter, who has recently received the Silver Star for his meritorious service in the U.S. Army during the Second World War.

Mr. MacWhorter earned this honor for his unwavering courage and heroism during the Battle of the Bulge. While holding a line of defense in Echternach, Luxembourg, the Germans counter-attacked and surrounded his unit, Company E of the 12th Infantry Battalion. He was subsequently captured, and he spent the next few months as a prisoner of war.

As a first lieutenant and the commander of unit 1542, Mr. MacWhorter saw combat in the Rhineland, Ardennes, and Central Europe. He was supposed to receive the Silver Star in 1947, but until now it was never given to him.

Mr. MacWhorter has been decorated many times for his valor on the field of battle. Prior to this honor, he had been awarded the European-African-Middle Eastern Service Medal, the American Service Medal, the Distinguished Unit Badge, and the Victory Medal.

After so many years of waiting, it is gratifying to see Mr. MacWhorter receive what is rightfully his. As Americans, we owe him a deep debt of gratitude for his service to the United States. I know his family and friends would like to join us here today in extending to him our deepest thanks and appreciation and to wish him many years of health and happiness. ●

ABORTION: ONE WOMAN'S ORDEAL

HON. ALAN B. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the consideration of my colleagues an article in the Washington Times outlining one woman's ordeal caused by her decision to abort her baby. It provides, I think, valuable insight on the abortion issue.

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 3, 1983]

WOMEN FORM WEBA TO FIGHT ABORTIONS
NANCYJO MANN ON THE HORROR OF HAVING AN ABORTION

(Every year for the past 10 years, 1.5 million women have had an abortion. For many, according to Nancyjo Mann, founder and president of Women Exploited By Abortion (WEBA), having an abortion only began their problem. Mann was interviewed by Washington Times staff writer and columnist Tom Diaz.)

Q: Tell us about your experience with abortion and its consequences.

A: My experience goes back to 1974, the month of October, 30th day—the day that I killed my baby girl. It was a second trimester abortion, I was 5½ months pregnant.

I went to the doctor because family members had pressured me, had encouraged me. There was no "Nancy maybe you should reconsider," because it was not my idea in the first place, it was theirs.

My husband had walked out the door and deserted us. The responsibility of three chil-

dren was just too much for him. I went to my mother and my brother and asked, "What am I going to do?" And my mother said "It's obvious, Nancy, no man's going to want you with three children, let alone the two you already have. You're probably not going to amount to a hill of beans and you're probably going to be on welfare the rest of your life."

And following those three positive, uplifting statements, she said "You're going to have to have an abortion." Then she called one of the leading ob/gyns in the Midwest, and he said, "Absolutely, no problem. Bring her on in."

Q: Did he know at the time how far you were along?

A: Absolutely. He does all kinds of second trimesters, no problem.

I went in and I asked, "What are you going to do to me?" All he did was look at my stomach and say, "I'm going to take a little fluid out, put a little fluid in, you'll have severe cramps and expel the fetus."

I said, "Is that all?" He said, "That's all." It didn't sound too bad. But what that doctor described to me was not the truth.

I went to the hospital and 60 ccs of amniotic fluid were drawn out, and a saline solution injected. Immediately the needle went through the abdomen I hated Nancyjo, I hated myself. With every ounce of my being I wanted to scream out "Please, stop don't do this to me." But I couldn't get it out.

Once they put in the saline there's no way to reverse it. And for the next hour and a half I felt my daughter thrash around violently while she was being choked, poisoned, burned and suffocated to death. I didn't know any of that was going to happen. And I remember talking to her and I remember telling her I didn't want to do this, I wished she could live. And yet she was dying and I remember her very last kick on her left side. She had no strength left.

I've tried to imagine us dying that kind of death, a pillow put over us, suffocating. In four minutes we'd pass out. We'd have that gift of passing out and then dying, but it took her an hour and a half just to die.

Then I was given an intravenous injection to help stimulate labor and I went into hard labor for 12 hours. And at 5:30 a.m. on the 31st of October I delivered my daughter whose name is now Charmaine Marie. She was 14 inches long. She weighed over a pound and a half. She had a head of hair and her eyes were opening.

I got to hold her because the nurses didn't make it to the room in time. I delivered my girl myself. They grabbed her out of my hands and threw her, into a bedpan. After they finished and took her away in the bedpan, they brought a lady in to finish her last hours of labor lying next to me. She had a healthy baby boy.

That was tough.

I like Nancyjo, I liked me, prior to the abortion. But shame and remorse and guilt set in—I mean, when you get a hold of your own daughter and you see what you did. She was not a "fetus." She was not a "product of conception." She was not a "tissue adhering to the uterine wall." She was my daughter and I got to hold her, at only 5½ months, 22 weeks. So those are cheap, inhuman words to use around me.

I chose to be sterilized because I couldn't cope with the idea that I could possibly kill again. It was too devastating. It was not something you go around telling people, that you just killed your baby, no problem. I was ashamed, totally ashamed.

Q: But some people would say that although this experience obviously had a great

impact on you, it is not characteristic of most other women who have abortions. Is your case unusual?

A: No, my case is not unusual at all. People want to say "Oh, but Nancy, you're the extreme." That's not true. In fact there are so many more of us than there are the other. The emotional hurt is so deep. You do not discuss your abortion, the suction machines and the needles and everything else, over a cup of tea and a cookie. Women just don't do this. The pain is just too deep and too great.

I'm sure there are women out there who are never fazed, never, by their abortion. But I would say that 98, 99 percent of them are fazed, whether it's for a small period of time or for the rest of their life, whether they suffer only a small degree or die from their abortions.

Q: How did WEBA—Women Exploited By Abortion—get started?

A: About one year ago I was talking to another recording artist who was pro-life. I asked what pro-life meant and he said he was anti-abortion. I said "Hank, I had an abortion in 1974. I was 5½ months pregnant. It hurt so bad for so long."

He just about drove the car off the road. And he said, "Nancy, you've got to tell the story." So, a year ago I went public, founded WEBA.

Q: How many members do you have?

A: I'm a 10-month-old corporation and in 10 months I've gone from being two people, my vice president and myself, in two states, Virginia and Iowa, to now having 34 states with approximately 10,000 women in my group.

Q: What are some of the effects of abortion on women?

A: I have women who cannot vacuum their carpets. They have to have the neighbor or their husbands do it while they're at the grocery store, because of the suction sound. You see, the suction machine (used in many abortions) makes that sucking sound—it's 29 times more powerful than the vacuum we use in our home. The majority of the women aren't put to sleep. It's done without being put to sleep. It's heartbreaking to me that they can't run a vacuum cleaner—that's a deep wound.

One psychological effect we see almost all the time is guilt. Others are suicidal impulses, a sense of loss, of unfulfillment. Mourning, regret and remorse. Withdrawal, loss of confidence in decisionmaking capabilities. They feel that maybe they've made a wrong decision, maybe they can't make another decision right in their life. Lowering of self esteem. Pre-occupation with death. Hostilities, self-destructive behavior, anger and rage. You can lose your temper quickly. A despair, helplessness, desire to remember the death date which is really weird but you do that. You remember these dates very strongly. A preoccupation with the would-be due date or due month. My daughter was due in early March, so in early March it's there.

An intent interest in babies but a thwarted maternal instinct. Women really are interested in babies, but I have many members who can't hold children. A hatred for anyone connected with abortion. Lack of desire to enter into a relationship with a partner, loss of interest in sex, an inability to forgive self, feeling of dehumanization, nightmares, seizures and tremors, frustrations, feeling of being exploited. And child abuse. We see a lot of child abuse.

I want you to understand that I do not come from any right to life organization.

We are connected with no one. We remain neutral. But we are the ones they are all arguing about and discussing and debating. We are the voice of experience.

I told Congressman (Henry A.) Waxman, D-Calif., at a recent hearing, "Have you ever had your cervix dilated and the womb ripped open? Have you ever had tubes stuck inside of you and everything sucked out? Have you ever had needles stuck through your abdomen? Have you ever felt your baby thrash around and die? Have you ever had hard labor, delivered and held your baby? Because if you haven't, sir, you can't intelligently talk to me about this. We are the voice of experience. We've all had this done to us."

And that's a fact. So we held our own ground, our own turf, our own territory.

Q: What is it that your organization does as a voice of experience?

A. We are a support group for those women who hurt—physically, emotionally, mentally and spiritually—from their abortions. We are there when the phone rings at 3 in the morning and someone is suicidal because maybe it was four years ago on that day and they still can't cope with it. We cry with them and talk with them. We are a support group. We also are a political group. I am classified as that, and I guess the strongest thing of what I intend to do—I intend to shut the abortion industry down. I intend to shut the abortion-on-demand industry down.

We also have rape victims and incest victims among our members—the other 3 percent (not abortion-on-demand). And every one of them is getting ready to go public, to speak very publicly—their full names, ages, everything. They're not ashamed. They know what happened to their lives. They became victims of an industry that is making lots of money, that was supposed to be a quick answer.

And now they're under psychiatric care, psychological care. Because of the abortion, not the rape and incest. They overcame the rape and the incest. Sure they needed help, but they overcame that. But they have had a very difficult time overcoming killing that innocent baby.

They heard of WEBA and they contacted us. And two of them were so brutally beaten they couldn't make it to the hospital in time. Pure rapes, I'm not talking about just a strong sexual aggressiveness. I'm talking about women who were brutally beaten, true rape victims.

Q: You talked about political activity. What's been your experience here in the Congress?

A: I testified two weeks ago before Rep. Waxman, Barbara Mikulski and a few other members of Congress. It was a stacked hearing—14 to 1 doesn't sound very balanced to me. But I went in very open and honest with them, they sat very intently and very amazed at the story I had to tell about my organization, myself and my constituency, WEBA.

Barbara Mikulski said "I've never heard this side." I said, "No, Pandora's box got opened up 10 years ago and now you're just starting to see it." I predict that in five years we will see an epidemic of mental and nervous breakdowns among the women of this country. People are not going to know why and I'm going to be able to tell you why: because they've had an abortion, that's why.

It's a quick solution. Abortion is not an ending of problems, it's the down payment for a whole new set of problems. That's what it is. It doesn't get rid of them.

Q: Have congressmen been exposed to your view, the voice of experience?

A: No. I hear time and time again, "I've never heard this side before." "Are there many more like you?" they ask. And my answer is this. Take the 15 million of us who have, by legal abortion-on-demand, killed our babies. I will give 2 million or 3 million to Planned Parenthood, NOW or whoever they want. I will give another 2 million or 3 million who have two or three abortions without open remorse.

And justification to oneself is important here, by the way. I don't know how many women I told to go have abortions. Justification. It's like, if you can have a few more, go do what you did and kind of justify it, it makes it better. It makes it not quite so bad.

That still leaves 9 million of us who've been hurt in one way, shape or form or the other—psychologically, physically, emotionally or spiritually.

Q: So you believe that there are—by conservative estimate—perhaps 10 million women who suffered as you did?

A: I believe by very conservative there's 8 million who have been hurt.

Q: Where can they write or call? Or what can they do if they need somebody, such as your organization?

A: They can call or they can write. The address is WEBA, 1553 24th St., Des Moines, Iowa 50311. Or they can reach me at 515-255-0552, my business phone. If they hurt, if they're at a certain state, I may have a state representative where a girl can be with them and talk with them. I get so many women who have written me to say, "Thank God, there is somebody that I can now finally pour the whole thing out to."

And I'm thankful that I am a Christian because I couldn't carry that load. If you could read my mail . . . It started off where I'd get two and three letters a day and now they're wrapping it in bundles to bring to me. And I get mail from all over the world.

Q: Within 10 months this has happened?

A: In 10 months. There is such a need. No one thought 10 years ago of the aftermath. We're the aftermath.●

HAZLETON ALL-AMERICAN GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM WINNER OF PENNSYLVANIA STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in its history, the All-American girls softball team of Hazleton has won the Pennsylvania State Championship.

That, of course, is quite an achievement in itself. In addition, the State championship carries with it an invitation to participate in the National Championship Tournament to be held in Tulsa, Okla., from August 11 through August 14.

The All-American Girls Softball League started in 1978 with 8 teams and now consists of 18. There are currently 300 girls in the league, all mem-

bers of the Amateur Softball Association. The girls are all from Hazleton and the surrounding area.

Throughout the years, they have participated in tournaments throughout Pennsylvania. In 1980, the All-American girls won first place trophy for best marching unit in the annual funfest parade. They actively participate in assisting charitable organizations, most recently be a benefit game for the cause of the United Rehabilitation Services.

The purpose of the league is to provide wholesome activity for girls between the ages of 8 and 15. The girls are sponsored by local businesses and organizations, who pay a yearly fee to help defray the cost of uniforms. The extraordinary expenses associated with the trip to Tulsa will be defrayed by contributions from the general public in the Hazleton community.

Because of their own efforts and the help of the community, these outstanding young women will represent the All-American Girls Softball Team at the National Championship in Tulsa: Melissa Butala, Janene Dagostino, Patti Seliga, Marine Sandrock, Tina Davis, Donna Yachera, Tanya Piehota, Janene Wallace, Kelly Ragan, Tammy Sukel, Francine Scarcella, Karen Ritz, Wendy McGarry, and Chris Seliga.

In acknowledging these outstanding young women, Mr. Speaker, we must also pay tribute to their coaches: Tom King, Janet Victor, Carol and John Sukel. It should also be noted that Mrs. Sukel is the chairman of the league and that Paul J. Paternoster is their public relations coordinator.

As these young women depart for Tulsa, they carry with them the best wishes and high hopes of the greater Hazleton community. It is my honor, Mr. Speaker, to join in this tribute to them and to share the story of this outstanding community endeavor with my friends and colleagues in the House.●

LEGISLATOR JOSEPH ADAMO

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to have this opportunity to join with the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association in congratulating Connecticut State Representative Joseph Adamo of West Haven, whom the CPCA has chosen as the 1983 "Outstanding Legislator of the Year."

As first-term Democrat from West Haven's 116th District, Representative Adamo spearheaded the efforts of

many State representatives and the CPCA in obtaining the passage of Public Act 83-212, "An Act Requiring Just Cause for Police Chiefs Dismissals." The requirement of proving "just cause" is designed to remove any possibility of politics entering into the decision to dismiss a police chief in Connecticut.

Representative Adamo is a member of the Labor and Public Employees Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly. In that capacity he has worked tirelessly and successfully for legislation to protect the rights of workers and to improve Connecticut's unemployment compensation benefits. Representative Adamo was also instrumental in the passage of tough new drunk driving legislation.

In a very short time, Representative Adamo has shown outstanding leadership capabilities and has impressed his constituents and colleagues with his dedication and hard work. The designation as "Outstanding Legislator of the Year" is one which Representative Adamo has earned by his work each and every day of his first term, and I know that I speak for his entire district when I say that he is truly deserving of this honor.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, August 4, 1982, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

AUGUST 5

9:30 a.m.

Joint Economic

To hold hearings on the employment/unemployment situation for the month of July.

SD-106

10:00 a.m.

Conferees

Closed, on S. 675, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Defense.

S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Conferees

Closed, on S. 675, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Defense.

S-407, Capitol

SEPTEMBER 8

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the breakdown of the traditional family unit, focusing on the historical perspective and societal implications.

SD-430

SEPTEMBER 13

10:00 a.m.

Select on Intelligence

Closed briefing on intelligence matters.

S-407, Capitol

SEPTEMBER 15

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 752, to provide for certain measures to reduce the salinity of the Colorado River, S. 1027, to provide that any construction costs undertaken by the State of Washington on the Yakima River basin water enhancement project made prior to congressional authorization of the project, may be credited toward any future cost-sharing requirements that Congress may impose at the time of authorization, and S. 483, to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to provide compensation to certain landowners who are deprived of winter stock water supply for their livestock along Willow Creek in Idaho.

SD-366

Labor and Human Resources

Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the breakdown of the traditional family unit, focusing on causes and remedies.

SD-430

SEPTEMBER 20

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to resume consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 2, calling for a mutual and verifiable freeze and reduction in nuclear weapons, and related resolutions, including Senate Joint Resolution 12, Senate Joint Resolution 29, Senate Joint Resolution 74, Senate Resolution 57, Senate Resolution 83, Senate Resolution 107, Senate Resolution 142,

Senate Resolution 159, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 46.

SD-419

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To resume hearings on a Presidential commission report on excellence in education.

SD-430

11:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearing to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1984 from the American Legion.

SR-325

SEPTEMBER 21

10:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 121, to establish a U.S. Department of Trade as an executive department of the Federal Government.

SD-342

SEPTEMBER 22

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To resume hearings on a Presidential commission report on excellence in education.

SD-430

SEPTEMBER 23

9:30 a.m.

Finance

Economic Growth, Employment and Revenue Sharing Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the future of U.S. basic industries.

SD-215

SEPTEMBER 27

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 19 and S. 918, bills to revise current Federal pension law with respect to the rights and benefits of working and nonworking women, and the substance of S. 372, to promote interstate commerce by prohibiting discrimination in the writing and selling of insurance contracts.

SD-430

SEPTEMBER 29

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To resume hearings on a Presidential commission report on excellence in education.

SD-430

OCTOBER 3

9:30 a.m.

Finance

Economic Growth, Employment and Revenue Sharing Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the future of U.S. basic industries.

SD-215

August 3, 1983

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

22773

OCTOBER 18

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcom-
mittee

To resume oversight hearings on voca-
tional education programs adminis-
tered by the Department of Educa-
tion.

SD-430

OCTOBER 25

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcom-
mittee

To resume oversight hearings on voca-
tional educational programs adminis-
tered by the Department of Educa-
tion.

SD-430

CANCELLATIONS

AUGUST 4

10:30 a.m.

Foreign Relations
Arms Control, Oceans, International Op-
erations, and Environment Subcom-
mittee

Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs
Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings on U.S. nuclear
assistance to India.

SD-419

